DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 732 HE 015 957

AUTHOR	Karp, Alan, Ed.
TITLE	History of Higher Education Annual, Volume Two, 1982.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Faculty of Educational Studies.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	173p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Faculty of Educational Studies, 367 Baldy Hall, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY 14260 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Viewpoints (120)
JOURNAL CIT	History of Higher Education Annual; v2 1982
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Church Related Colleges; College Faculty; Departments; Educational Development; *Educational History; Educational Quality; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Leadership Qualities; *Personality Development; Professional Associations; Reputation; School Counseling; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

Five articles on historical developments in higher education are presented. In "Oxford Dons and Professional Men in Victorian England," Arthur Engel discusses how 19th century Oxford dons sought to make university teaching into a profession, as well as the trend toward specialization in other developing professions. In "'Western' Colleges, 1830-1870: Educational Institutions in Transition," James Findlay identifies the contributions that private, sectarian colleges in the midwest made to American higher education before 1870. In "The Mental Hygiene Movement and the Development of Personality: Changing Conceptions of the American College and University, 1920-1940," Sol Cohen describes an attempt by psychiatrists to make personality development the guiding principle of American higher education. In "Academic Quality Rankings: Why They Developed in the United States and Not Europe," David S. Webster considers the development in the United States of academic quality rankings of colleges or departments, as well as the different natures of European and American universities. Lastly in "Against the Grain: Toward an Alternative Interpretation of Academic Professionalization," Sheila Slaughter and Edward T. Silva describe findings of a survey of the characteristics of leaders of social science organizations. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227732

History of Higher Education Annual

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SUNY
Buffalo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 015 957

Volume Two 2 1982

History of Higher Education Annual

1982

CONTENTS

Oxford Dons and Professional Men in Victorian England	Arthur Engel	3
"Western" Colleges, 1830-1870: Educational Institutions in Transition	James Findlay	35
The Mental Hygiene Movement and the Development of Personality: Changing Conceptions of the American College and University, 1920-1940.	Sol Cohen	65
Academic Quality Rankings: Why They Developed in the United States and not Europe	David S. Webster	102
Against the Grain: Toward an Alternative Interpretation of Academic Professionalization	Sheila Slaughter Edward T. Silva	128
The Authors		171

EDITORIAL BOARD

Joan N. Burstyn, Rutgers University

E. D. Duryea, Editor, State University of New York at Buffalo

Arthur Engel, Virginia Commonwealth University

Peter Dobkin Hall, Yale University

Jurgen Herbst, University of Wisconsin-Madison

David R. Jones, University of Melbourne, Australia

Alan Karp, Managing Editor, Teachers College, Columbia University

James McLachlan, New York, New York

Walter P. Metzger, Columbia University

David B. Potts, Gettysburg College

Laurence R. Veysey, University of California, Santa Cruz

The HISTORY OF HIGHER EDUCATION ANNUAL is published under the auspices of the Faculty of Educational Studies of the State University of New York at Buffalo. International in scope, it publishes contributions spanning all historical approaches to the study of higher education. Subscription to the Annual is $5 annually, to order of Faculty of Educational Studies, 367 Baldy, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260.

Contributions should be submitted to Dr. Alan Karp, Managing Editor, Box 131, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027. Manuscripts should be forwarded in triplicate with the author's name and institution on the cover sheet of one copy only. The style guide is the University of Chicago Manual of Style, 12th edition, revised. Details available upon request.

Copyright 1982.

The cover picture Trinity College, Oxford University, 1882.

Oxford Dons and Professional Men in Victorian England

Arthur Engel

To the historian of nineteenth century England, the subject of "the rise of the professions" and the definition of a "professional man" are important, not simply as matters of abstract sociological theory, but rather because they were questions of the deepest import for Victorian people themselves. Oxford dons were only one of a seemingly endless army of occupational groups which, throughout the nineteenth century and continuing into the present, have attempted to secure for themselves the coveted position of a "profession." What did they mean by a "profession" and why did they consider this status so valuable? What relation did their notions have to the traditional conceptions of "the learned professions" as they existed since the Renaissance? To what degree can the theories of modern sociologists of the professions illuminate their concerns?

The Oxford Don: Status and Professionalism

Beginning as early as the 1820s -- notably in the EDINBURGH REVIEW -- and continuing until their substantial victories of the 1870s and 1880s, Oxford reformers constantly reiterated their desire to reorganize the collegiate system so that college tutors might look upon their duties as "a regular profession." By a "profession" these reformers meant, at a minimum, an occupational role which could be held for life by a married man. Until the reforms of the 1870s and 1880s, most of the teaching in the university was necessarily in the hands of unmarried men, since a college fellowship, a substantial part of the effective income of the don, was by statute denied to married men. This problem was a peculiarity of Oxford and Cambridge and has no parallel either for the academic profession as a whole, or for the other developing professions of the nineteenth century. The Oxford reformers, however, meant more than mere permission to marry when they expressed their desire for a profession. Their central goal was to retain their traditional social status while converting their collegiate position into one which could be held by a married man.

In the early nineteenth century, the Oxford don was by profession a clergyman, not a university teacher. In most cases, holy orders were a condition for holding a fellowship and the don was destined to resign this prize after about ten years in order to marry and take up the duties of a country parson. The church was the only profession smoothly connected to holding a college fellowship. It was, of course, possible in some cases for a fellow to use his college

income to support himself while attempting to make a career in law or medicine. However, the colleges could not provide clients or patients, but they could provide church livings. The result was that even in those colleges that did not require most fellows to be in holy orders, the great majority choose this path.

Typically, an Oxford fellow won his fellowship soon after receiving his B.A., and for the next ten to fifteen years he would take deacon's and then priest's orders, probably spending some part of this time as a curate or holding a poor living. If the living was in or near Oxford, he would live in his rooms in college. At some point during his tenure of the fellowship, this hypothetical don would likely be called upon to hold a college office, dean, tutor, bursar, etc., requiring residence. At the end of this period of ten to fifteen years, the don would probably have acquired enough seniority among the fellows to be offered one of the church livings in the gift of the college. He would then take the living, resign his fellowship, and leave Oxford for a career in the church. Clearly, for this man, the fellowship and teaching duties in Oxford were not a career for life; they were a prize and a rung on a ladder leading to a career in the church.

By the end of the nineteenth century, this career link had become the exception rather than the rule. Four important government commissions in 1850-52, 1854-58, 1871-73, and 1877-81 culminated in major revisions of college and university statutes affecting the senior members of the university. Although the outward structure of a fellowship changed little, its function was altered drastically. Most fellows, and

virtually all of the younger ones, were engaged in teaching within the college. Furthermore, as Table 1 indicates, for most fellows teaching was no longer an interlude before commencing a true career; it had become a career. College tutors were permitted to marry while retaining their fellowships and many did remain in Oxford all their lives as teachers and scholars. Even those who left often went to positions at other universities. The outlines of the academic life as a profession had already been drawn.(1)

The transformation of university teaching from an aspect of a clerical career into a separate profession was not a unique or isolated phenomenon. It was part of the larger movement toward the development and expansion of the professions in Victorian society. When R. L. Edgeworth published his ESSAYS ON PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION in 1809, he assumed the professions to consist only of the church, the law, medicine and the army. By 1933, Carr-Saunders and Wilson, in their study of THE PROFESSIONS, listed 16 distinct professions,(2). Even this growth does not fully indicate the magnitude of the change since Carr-Saunders and Wilson refused to include many vocations whose associations, modeled on those of the recognized professions, announced their aspirations toward professional status. A more recent study, which rejected this exlusion as an unwarranted value judgment, listed 78 separate professions and over one hundred professional organizations.(3) It was within this expanding world of professions that academic men, too, were able to find a place for themselves.

The structure and values of the career which

Oxford dons succeeded in creating for themselves owed much to enduring conceptions of the nature of professional employment. Their goal was not merely to make university teaching into a permanent career but rather to make it into a profession, comparable in rewards and social position to the traditional learned professions of barrister, physician and clergyman. Nevertheless, the conditions of academic life seemed to bear little imprint of the two main structural characteristics which modern sociologists have used to define a profession; i.e., the application of a branch of learning or science to a practical area of life and the existence of an association serving to license practitioners and promulgate standards of ethical conduct.(4) Teaching and research might be squeezed to fit the first of these characteristics but the second seems to have been entirely absent from the concerns of nineteenth century Oxford dons.

The reason for this omission was simply that the vital functions performed by professional associations were satisfied for Oxford academic men by the colleges and the fellowship system. Carr-Saunders observed that the goal of professional associations was to raise both the level of attainment and the standard of professional conduct of practitioners by separating the qualified from the unqualified.(5) Professional associations served to control entry to the profession, to grant this exclusionary power to members of the profession itself, and to reduce the potential dominance which, under the ordinary rules of the market-place, would have belonged either to the employing institution or to the consumer. But the dons themselves decided who was qualified and who was not,

especially after 1854, when most of the previous restrictions of fellowships to specific localities, schools or families were abolished and "open competition" became the rule in fellowship elections. Thus they did not need professional associations to fulfill these purposes.

Oxford dons, however, were as concerned with problems of status as other nascent professional men in the nineteenth century. The new professions often expressed this concern explicitly in their foundation charters. For example, the charter of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, founded in 1844, mentioned the hope that this association would "contribute to the respectability" of the profession. Similarly, the charter of the National Union of Teachers, founded in 1870, referred to the desire of the association to "raise the status of the teaching profession."(6) Although academic men at Oxford were more concerned with maintaining their traditional social position rather than raising it, the problems they encountered were often analogous to those experienced by other new professions in the nineteenth century.

Oxford dons, in fact, cut away an important element of their status in attempting to make the position of the university teacher a permanent career, separate from that of the clergyman. The traditional social rank of the clergyman had served to compensate for the conspicuous lack of high status in the role of teacher itself. This was certainly true for schoolmasters, that occupation whose functions were most similar to those of the college don. Mr. Riley,

the worldly lawyer in George Eliot's THE MILL ON THE FLOSS (1860), expressed this attitude bluntly: "the best schoolmasters are of the clergy," he insisted. "The schoolmasters who are not clergymen, are a very low set of men generally... A clergyman is a gentleman by profession and education ..."(7) Academic men's insistence on the analogy between their career and the traditional "higher professions" was an attempt to obtain a new source of assured status to replace their old connection with the church. As professional men, dons could be certain that they would not be viewed as a "low set of men" by the Mr. Rileys of the world.

High social position was a crucial element in Victorian people's conception of professional work. Anthony Trollope expressed succinctly this popular understanding in his definition of a profession as "a calling by which a gentleman, not born to the inheritance of a gentleman's allowance of good things, might ingeniously obtain the same by some exercise of his abilities."(8) In this definition, Trollope was simply echoing a connection between the professions and the status of the gentleman which had been recognized since the Renaissance. As early as 1577, William Harrison included the following remark in his acerbic but accurate account of those who were permitted to possess a coat of arms:

> Whosever studieth the laws of this realm, who so abideth in the university giving his mind to books, or professeth physic and the liberal sciences, or beside his service in the role of captain of wars or good counsel at home,

> whereby his commonwealth is benefitted, can live without manual labour, and thereto is able and will bear the post, charge and countenance of a gentleman, he shall for money have a coat and arms bestowed upon him by the herald... and reputed gentleman ever after.(9)

Ever since the Renaissance, this idea of the "gentleman" had increasingly become the most important of status distinctions in English society. This concept embodied the ideal of ruling class egalitarianism: all men were not socially equal, but all gentleman were. Fundamentally, a profession was an occupation which a gentleman could follow without losing his claim to this coveted social position.

A perceptive modern literacy critic has noted the extreme and growing importance in the nineteenth century of the idea of the gentleman. "The question is the burning Victorian question," V.S. Pritchett has asserted. "What is a gentleman? It is the obsessive preoccupation of the ever-expanding middle class."(10) Several recent historians of English education have remarked that the public schools and ancient universities, with their uniform and distinctive curricula and their strong sense of social community, played an important role in creating and maintaining the solidarity of the gentleman-class.(11) It has been argued that much of the impetus for the growth of the nineteenth century professions was the need to expand the parameters of opportunity for obtaining "a gentleman's allowance of the good things" for the

growing numbers receiving this kind of education.(12)

Oxford dons found themselves in a situation analogous in certain ways to that of these new recruits to ruling-class values. Throughout the nineteenth century, the great majority of Oxford dons were from families of undisputed "gentleman" status, but few were men of independent wealth. Table 2 compares the social background of dons first appointed to college offices from 1813 to 1830 with those first appointed from 1881 to 1900. The data indicate that about 80 percent in both periods were of the "gentleman-class."

However, only a few of the sons of "squires/private gentlemen and "merchants/manufacturers" could have inherited enough private wealth to make an occupation financially unnecessary. Their social need was to obtain a life-career without endangering their position as gentlemen. The obvious solution to this dilemna, sanctioned by growing social usage during the nineteenth century, was for the don to become a professional man.

There is also some indication that family background played a role in the drive toward professionalism of Oxford dons. Although there was no change in the basic social class of most Oxford dons during the nineteenth century, there was a significant change in the distribution among different types of "gentleman-class" backgrounds. The late nineteenth century dons who rejected their traditional clerical position and chose to become members of a secular profession were themselves only half as likely to be

the sons of clergymen, and were twice as likely to be the sons of secular professional men as the dons of the early nineteenth century. Dons of clerical background fell from 45 percent of the total group to only 26 percent, while dons of professional families rose from 8 percent to 21 percent.(13) It is therefore possible that the professional ideology which Oxford dons applied to their own careers in the latter part of the nineteenth century had been learned in their homes as well as from the values of the society at large.

The concern with preserving a high social position played a large role in determining the organizational structure of the academic profession as it developed at Oxford. The dangers threatening the position of the don as a gentleman were first, the possibility that his income might be inadequate to support a gentlemanly style of life for a married man and, second, that his conditions of employment might be altered to include undesirable duties incompatible with the status of a gentleman.

Both of these considerations impelled the reformer to insist on retaining the collegiate system and the college fellowship as the basis of this new profession. It may well have been the increasing value of college fellowships in the early nineteenth century, together with rising student numbers and fees, which first suggested to the don the possibility that a gentlemanly style of life might be supported by college teaching. At any rate, it was crucial to retain the rich collegiate endowments for the support of the don if the necessary income was to be maintained.

The fellowship system, however, also recommended itself as a form of protection from the second danger of undesirable conditions of employment. Legally, a fellowship was a share in the proceeds derived by the college from its property. It therefore connected the position of the don with the traditional gentlemanly status of the landed proprietor. As Charles Neate, fellow of Oriel, remarked in 1854 when Lord John Russell was so ill-advised as to refer to a fellowship as a "salary":

> Does John Russell know that I can mortage my fellowship, that I can make over to a creditor or an assignee the right to receive during my life my share of the revenues of my College. Salary indeed! I have no more a salary than Lord John Russell himself and I work less for it.(14)

Neate argued that it was precisely this characteristic which made Oxford and Cambridge preeminent as "places of education." Because a fellow's income was not a mere salary, "the teachers...are more independent of their occupation for a maintenance than anywhere else..."(15) It was this independence which

> . . .leads the Undergraduate to respect in his own Tutor the spontaneous exercise of an honourable calling... teaching is less with him a necessity, less a trade,... he might live if he liked as an idle gentleman, taking his ease in his College, and borrowing from the shadow of its ancient

> walls, which are his property, something of dignity in his ease.(16)

The fellowship system insured that the college teacher would not be reduced to dependence upon student fees. This was a very real threat as it was generally recogized in Oxford that the most effective teaching in the first half of the nineteenth century was in the hands of private tutors or coaches who were paid directly by students. Robert Lowe, the logically consistent laissez-faire reformer, suggested as early as 1850 that the best way to insure effective university teaching was to eliminate all endowments for education and thus make the teacher completely dependent upon student fees.(17) Undergraduates would be certain to choose those teachers with the best records of success in preparing students for examinations. In this way effective teachers would prosper and inefficient ones would be forced out of the field by lack of clients.

This argument was threatening not only because of the proven effectiveness of the system of private tuition in relation to the examination system, but also because this kind of argument was consistent with the laissez-faire "climate of opinion" of the age. Fundamentally, the problem was one of status more than of income. The best coaches often earned large incomes, albeit for heavy teaching duties. The real difficulty was that the relationship between coach and student was essentially that of tradesman and consumer. The student, the consumer, was the ultimate judge of the relationship's effectiveness. This situation could

be accepted, if need be, by the professional, since his claims to special knowledge and expertise could be invoked to make him appear the better judge of his efficiency than the client, patient or consumer. Physicians and lawyers, indeed all professionals who work in independent entreprenurial settings, must confront this problem. Nonetheless, it is preferable and more in keeping with the dignity of the professional man for this potential power to be completely removed from the consumer. The fellowship system accomplished this goal by making the college teacher's income only partially dependent upon student fees. The college system itself did the rest by insuring that students chose their tutors only in the limited sense that they could select a college known to have effective tutors. Once the student committed himself to a college, all effective choice was removed from his hands.

The interest in professionalization as a mode of acquiring status has long been recognized by students of the professions. T. H. Marshall, in a seminal article of 1939, echoed Trollope's blunt definition of a profession when he noted that, "the professions were, in English parlance, the occupations suitable for gentleman."(18) Carr-Saunders and Wilson, in their study of the British professions, and Philip Elliott, in a recent monograph, also noted this theme.(19) However, all of these commentators argued that a crucial change had taken place in the social role of the professions: the importance of status considerations had declined as specialized knowledge increased. Marshall, Carr-Saunders and Wilson saw this as a trend of their own time, while Elliott pushed its

beginnings back into the nineteenth century. Elliott stated the thesis most explicitly. He argued that the nineteenth century saw

> . . . the decline of status professionalism in which professions were relatively unimportant in the organization of work or community services but occupied a niche high in the system of social stratification, and conversely the rise of occupational professionalism, based on specialization of knowledge and task.(20)

In certain respects, this model seems to fit very well the development of the academic profession at Oxford. Most college tutors of the early nineteenth century doubtless did consider their status as clergymen and college fellows more important than their occupation as tutors in defining their position in life.(21) The average don of this period was also relatively unspecialized; he taught all the Greek and Latin language, history, literature and philosophy needed for the examinations. The only exception was the few mathematicians needed for the small number of students who read for the Honour School of Mathematics and Physical Science. Increasing specialization in subjects among the college tutors went together with increased professional aspirations.(22) Examination schools proliferated and dons began to concentrate on narrower fields even within each school. For example, in the dominant field of classical studies, where in 1800 there had simply been the "Greats" tutor responsible for all classical teaching, by 1900 there

was an ancient historian, a classical philologist, experts in Greek and Latin literature and specialists in classical philosophy.

Nonetheless, it would be misleading to separate status aspirations from the movement for increased specialization. It should not be assumed that the process of specialization increased teacher effectiveness. The official college tutors were rendered obsolete by the increasing complexity and competitiveness of the examination system in the first half of the nineteenth century, but the unofficial coaches or private tutors may well have been more effective as teachers than the specialized scholars who took their place. It was certainly recognized that the coaches' teaching was more exclusively geared to the needs of the examinations.

In fact, it may well be that the leading attraction of specialization for reformist Oxford dons was the rationale it provided for their efforts to transform college teaching into a desirable life career. Considering the rigid and slowly changing nature of the Oxford examinations, it was not at all clear that teaching could be a "progressive career"; that is, a career in which a scale of payment which increased with age could be justified on the basis of greater efficiency through experience. The best teacher within the old system was generally a young man who had just successfully completed the examinations himself and therefore could easily understand the difficulties of men a few years younger than himself who were undergoing the same trial.

Increased specialization, therefore, could provide a rationale for a progressive career for teachers. With few exceptions, such as the more abstract branches of mathematics, physics and philosophy, most scholars improve with experience. This formed a good argument for why Oxford dons ought to have life careers within the university and why their income ought generally to increase as they grew older as well. Specialization was thus a rationalization of the desire for professional status; it offered a route by which such status could be acquired. During the nineteenth century, the Oxford examination system became less narrowly pedagogical and increasingly congruent with the developing scholarship in each field. The result of this transformation was to take away the competitive advantage of the young "crammer" as college teacher and give it instead to the more advanced scholar.

The New Professions: Education and Professionalism

A similar pattern can be traced in the motives for specialization in other developing professions in the nineteenth century. The first impetus toward specialization and increased technical education generally came from the lower branches of a profession where the need for enhanced status was strongest. It was not physicians or barristers who first interested themselves in accreditation, certification and technical education, but surgeons, apothecaries and solicitors. It seems clear that this movement was not separate from their status aspirations, but simply the means by which they hoped to fulfill them. From this

point of view, Elliott's distinction between "status professionalism" and "occupational professionalism" collapses and one is left with a single tradition of status aspirations, with different modes of attainment suited to different periods of history.

The cornerstone of the concept of "occupational professionalism" is the notion that modern professions are more firmly based on advanced technical knowledge than was previously the case. However, the relationship between professionalism and increased technical knowledge during the nineteenth century was more complex that has often been supposed. In some cases, the need to remove socially degrading duties from professional work actually required a decrease in technical knowledge. In other cases, the dictates of status and the needs for increased technical knowledge were perfectly congruent. In all cases, however, there was a need to form a sometimes uneasy alliance between technical knowledge and the broadening "liberal education" which was required if the character of the professional man and that of the gentleman were to be integrated.

The change in the English medical profession during the nineteenth century reveals a pattern in which status considerations were clearly of equal or even greater importance than concern for increased technical knowledge among practitioners. In the mid-nineteenth century, the surgeon transformed his position into that of a full professional, comparable in status to a physician. Prior to this time, the surgeon was trained through a system of apprenticeship and, in practice (though not by statute), generally

made and sold medicines as well as prescribing them. It is significant that the trend toward formal training was accompanied by a concerted effort on the part of the new professionalizing reformers to eliminate from their duties what they considered the mere tradesman's function of selling and compounding medicines. Sir Henry Acland, Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford and the most prominent local physician, was a firm opponent of this practice. His biographer noted with satisfaction that "Acland ultimately succeeded in breaking down the practice and putting the payment of medical men on a proper footing."(23)

This theme can be seen clearly in the story of Lydgate in George Eliot's MIDDLEMARCH (1972). Lydgate was the type of new "professional" surgeon who looked upon the selling of medicines as mercenary and degrading.(24) To George Eliot, he represented the high ideals of the new professional men. She also made the important point that Lydgate, unlike the other practitioners in the city, was born a gentleman(25) and that it was the connection with business and trade which made the selling of drugs repugnant to him. Although the Lydgates and the Aclands ultimately succeeded in defining their profession in their own terms, they encountered much opposition.

If one looks back into nineteenth century writings on this subject, the allegedly superior "technical knowledge" of the reforming professional men was by no means self-evident to all. One old-fashioned fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, who disapproved of the new trend, saw clearly how important the status issue was for the young reformers. He noted that the younger

surgeons

> . . . have a disposition to regard the multifarious services of the pharmacy as matters beneath his scientific consideration, - as duties to be performed by a mere tradesman, rather than by a professor of medicine and surgery, who is a member of the College of Surgeons and a Licenciate of the College of Physicians.(26)

He argued that a surgeon was no less a genuine professional man for selling medicine; in fact, only in this way could the surgeon really know what medicine the patient was receiving. "A professional man should do his duty," he roundly declared, "instead of paying another person to do it for him."(27)

By the time these lines were written in the 1890s, the trend which they deplored was already an accomplished fact. Nonetheless, the old-fashioned surgeon concluded that the change, the desirability of which was so completely assumed by Acland's biographer, was "no genuine reform, but a change for the worse."(28) It is thus arguable that status considerations were more important than questions of technical knowledge to the surgeons who sought to "professionalize" their vocation. Perhaps the old-fashioned practitioner who knew how to compound his own medicines really did possess the superior technical knowledge. In any case, there can be little doubt that the basic force behind the shift in the surgeon's role was the desire to eliminate all degrading connections with mere business or trade from the duties of the

professional man.(29)

The change in the profession of the naval officer during the nineteenth century reveals a more harmonious relationship between status aspirations and increased technical knowledge. When Macaulay wrote, with typical self-satisfaction, of the change which had taken place in the quality of naval officers from the late seventeenth century until the mid-nineteenth century, he emphasized the associaton between their development of technical expertise and their rise in social status. Macaulay deplored the late seventeenth century situation in which captaincies were often given to men with no knowledge of seamanship, possessing as a qualification only high social rank. This much would fit well with Elliott's theory of "status professionalism." However, Macaulay also deplored the absence of social rank and liberal education among the experienced officers of the late seventeenth century. Of these experienced officers he wrote:

> All their knowledge was professional; and their professional knowledge was practical rather than scientific. Off their own element they were as simple as children. Their deportment was uncouth. . . it does not appear that there was in the service of any of the Stuarts a single naval officer such as, according to the notions of our time, a naval officer ought to be, that is to say, a man versed in the theory and practice of his calling, and steeled against all the dangers of battle and tempest, yet of

> cultivated mind and polished manners. There were gentlemen and there were seamen in the navy of Charles the Second. But the seamen were not gentlemen; and the gentlemen were not seamen.(30)

For Macaulay, therefore, the critical change that had taken place in the nature of the naval profession was not simply that greater emphasis was placed on technical knowledge. Rather, the knowledge itself had been transformed from the merely "practical" to the "scientific;" the officer now understood the "theory" as well as merely the "practice" of his duties; and this knowledge had become united with a "cultivated mind and polished manners;" the character of the "seaman" and that of the "gentleman" had been integrated.

Although Macaulay did not explain how this change had come about, it seems clear that education played a crucial role. Essentially the change from the "practical" to the "scientific" and from "practice" to "theory" may be understood as a change from knowledge gained through experience to knowledge gained by systematic and formal professional education. Similarly, the "cultivated mind and polished manners" which were essential to the status of the gentleman were the result of the socialization which was an inevitable concommitant of the liberal education which preceded this formal professional education.(31)

The fit between liberal and professional education, however, was not always as smooth as Macaulay supposed. If the ideology of liberal

education as a broadening training was accepted at face value, the result could be a revulsion from the necessarily narrowing effects of professional studies. In 1849 J. A. Froude, then a young fellow at Exeter College, Oxford embodied this theme in a controversial novel which ironically cost him his fellowship (for its theological rather than its pedagogical unorthodoxy). "You know a lawyer when you see him, or a doctor, or a professional clergyman," he remarked. "They are not simply men, but men of a particular sort, and unfortunately, something not more but less than men - men who have sacrified their own selves to become the paid instruments of a system."(32)

Froude complained that liberal education was not a good preparation for the professions, precisely because it presented the student with ideals which were too exalted for the narrowing interests demanded by professional studies and practice. He lamented:

> Surely it were kinder far to train us out from our cradles into a course which should be chosen for us, and make us begin our crawling on the road we are to travel, with spelling-books of law and physic, and nursery courts of justice, or diseased dolls to lecture or to doctor. All would be so easy then; we should form each about our proper center, and revolve calmly and surely in the orbit into which we were projected. It is a frightful business to bring us up to be only men, and then bid us choose for ourselves one of three roads which are to take us down

again.(33)

Since the church was the most obvious profession for a young man in Froude's position it was toward this profession that he displayed a special bitterness. "I cannot understand why, as a body, clergymen are so fatally uninteresting," he asserted. "It is the curse of making it a profession - a road to get on upon, to succeed in life upon," he concluded.(34)

Fortunately for the votaries of liberal education as a preparation for the professions, such iconoclasts as Froude were few. Most accepted the view that liberal education was an ideal preparation for the learned professions because it trained and disciplined the mind for the demanding tasks ahead. In one of her early stories, Mrs. Humphrey Ward expressed this ideal in her characterization of Eustace Kendal as the ideal product of a liberal education. "The first crude difficulties of accumulation are over... The world of fact and idea is open, and the explorer's instruments are as perfect as they can be made."(35)

This idea of the value of liberal education was especially useful in the case of the church, since the canonical age for taking deacon's orders was twenty-one and it was obvious that the budding clergyman should be under some discipline during the critical years between school and the taking of holy orders. The university neatly fulfilled this need. The "fit" was less good in the case of law or medicine, since the common pattern in both was to begin apprenticeship training immediately after school. The result was that in the early nineteenth century, few university students were

intended for careers in the law or medicine. By the late nineteenth century, however, it was discovered that professional studies often could be deferred longer than had previously been thought desirable. While some old-fashioned practitioners were known to grumble that the young men were unfit for hard professional work by the long vacations which characterized university life, such critics had clearly become a rear-guard by this time. The movement was toward increasing use of liberal education at the university as preparation for futher, more narrowly professional studies.

Clearly the relationship between liberal education, technical studies and professionalism has been largely shaped by the status motives of nascent professional people. Any study of the process of professionalization, therefore, must be at least as much a study of historical actors' motives as of the formal structural development of their careers. As the American sociologist Everett Cherrington Hughes wrote, "In my own studies I passed from the false question 'Is this occupation a profession?' to the more fundamental one, 'What are the circumstances in which people in an occupation attempt to turn it into a profession, and themselves into professional people...'"(36) This question has increased in importance as the growth of professional consciousness has become one of the primary phenomena of 20th century social history. The nineteenth century Oxford dons who transformed academic work from an aspect of the profession of clergyman into a separate profession with distinct values and structural characteristics are important not only as one historical instance of this

professional consciousness, but also because their transformation of educational ideals and the role of the university in English society had profound implications for the strategies that would be adopted by later aspirants to professional status.

1982 27

Table 1: CAREERS OF OXFORD DONS

Dates	In Holy Orders	Future Career in Church(a)	Future Career in University(b)	Mixed Careers(c)	Other Careers(d)	Total in Sample
1813-1830	92%	53%(40)	13%(10)	13%(10)	21%(16)	76
1881-1900	69%	9%(7)	57%(44)	13%(10)	21%(16)	77

Method of Sample: In each of these two time periods, a list of all men appointed to college offices was compiled, chronologically by college, using the University Calendar. The sample consists of every fifth name on each of these lists.

(a)Those who did not attain a professorship, headship, or "official fellowship" in Oxford or an academic position in another university, and left Oxford for a career in the church.

(b)Those who did attain a professorship, headship, or "official fellowship" in Oxford or an academic position in another university, but did not spend their entire active careers within the university. In all cases but two in the 1881-1900 period (one law professor who became a judge, and one colonial governor who became the head of a college), all men in this category held church as well as academic positions (e.g., a college fellow who became a country parson and then returned to Oxford as head of this college or a professor or college head who became a bishop).

(d)Those who did not attain a professorship, headship, or "official fellowship" in Oxford or an academic position at another university, and spent their active careers outside the church (e.g., barristers, schoolmasters, government officials, etc.).

Table 2: SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF OXFORD DONS BY FATHERS' OCCUPATION

	1813-30	1881-1900
Gentleman-Class		
Clergymen(a)	34 (45%)	20 (26%)
Squires/Private Gentlemen	10 (13%)	7 (9%)
Merchants/Manufacturers	9 (12%)	14 (18%)
Professional Men(b)	6 (8%)	16 (21%)
"Armigers"(a)	3 (4%)	1 (1%)
Academic Men	. . . .	2 (3%)
Civil Service	. . . .	1 (1%)
Subtotal	62 (82%)	61 (79%)
Non-Gentlemen-Class		
Clerks/Shopkeepers	1 (1%)	5 (6%)
Farmers	1 (1%)	2 (3%)
"Plebians"(a)	2 (3%)	. . . .
Non-Conformist Ministers	. . . .	3 (4%)
Parish Schoolmasters (Scotland)	. . . .	1 (1%)
Subtotal	4 (5%)	11 (14%)
Unknown		
"Gentlemen"(a)	10 (13%)	2 (3%)
Other Unknown(c)	. . . .	3 (4%)
Subtotal	10 (13%)	5 (7%)
Total	76	77

Method of Sample: In each of these two time periods a list of all men appointed to college offices was compiled chronologically by college, using the UNIVERSITY CALENDARS. The sample consists of every fifth name on each of these lists.

(a)These are the categories provided by the matriculation registers. Only "clergyman" is unambiguous. However, I think one is justified in assuming that no one would write "plebian" for his social background unless that designation was correct. Similarly, among those dons about whom I was able to find a concrete fathers' occupation from local directories, biographies, school registers, etc., there was no instance of a man writing "arminger" whose father was not a "gentleman." The category of "gentleman" itself, unfortunately, is too ambiguous to be of any use. I suspect that most of these, ironically, would not be "gentleman" by accepted nineteenth century usage. Since matriculants were given no choice below "gentleman" except "plebian," it is not surprising that most chose the higher designation.

(b)Virtually all of these were barristers, solicitors, physicians or surgeons. However, I have included one architect and one civil engineer.

(c)This category indictes those men who neglected to specifiy their social background in the matriculation register and about whom I could find no other social information.

Footnotes

1. This change was not, of course, confined to Oxford. Professional development characterized all of the English universities in the nineteenth century. Cambridge's clerical traditions and collegiate institutions made for a pattern of change similar to Oxford's, while London and the new civic universities never had to battle these particular obstacles to professional careers. Their major problems, instead, concerned providing sufficient incomes to support professional status and protecting dons from interference with their professional autonomy.

2. See R. L. Edgeworth, ESSAYS ON PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (London: Printed for J. Johnson and Co., 1809) and A. M. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, THE PROFESSIONS (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), table 3, p. 507. The professions listed were barristers, solicitors, patent agents, physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, engineers, chemists, physicists, architects, surveyors, etc., accountants, actuaries, civil servants, and teachers.

3. Geoffrey Millerson, THE QUALIFYING ASSOCIATIONS: A STUDY IN PROFESSIONALIZATION (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964). See especially pp. 222-45 for the lists of "fields" having one or more "qualifying association."

4. The most influential structuralist interpretation of professionalism has been that of Talcott Parsons. See his THE SOCIAL SYSTEM (Glencoe, III.: Free Press, 1951),

and "The Professions and Social Structure," in ESSAYS IN SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1954), pp. 34-49.

5. A. M. Carr-Saunders, PROFESSIONS: THEIR ORGANIZATION AND PLACE IN SOCIETY (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), cited by H. M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, eds., PROFESSIONALIZATION (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 5-7. Carr-Saunders quoted the PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNAL for 1847: "The Pharmaceutical Society was designed as a means of raising the qualifications of pharmaceutical chemists and placing between them and unqualified persons a line of demarcation." Vollmer and Mills, eds., PROFESSIONALIZATION, p. 5.

6. Vollmer and Mills, eds., PROFESSIONALIZATION, pp. 6-7.

7. THE MILL ON THE FLOSS (1860) (Oxford: Clarendon Press Edition, 1980), bk. 1, chap. 3, p. 20.

8. THE BERTRAMS (1859), chap. 8, p. 84.

9. "Description of Britain," in Raphael Holinshead, CHRONICLES OF ENGLAND (1577). Cited by Peter Laslett, THE WORLD WE HAVE LOST (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 34.

10. GEORGE MERIDITH AND ENGLISH COMEDY (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 75.

11. See T. W. Bamford, THE RISE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (London: Nelson, 1967); and R. H. Wilkinson, THE PREFECTS (London: Oxford University Press, 1964).

12. See F. Musgrove, "Middle-Class Education and Employment in the Nineteenth Century,"

ECONOMIC HISTORY REVIEW, 2d ser., 12 (1959-60): 99-111.

13. Ibid. Compare I.a. and I.d.

14. OBJECTIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT SCHEME FOR THE PRESENT SUBJUGATION AND FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD (1854), p. 32.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid. p. 33.

17. See OXFORD UNIVERSITY COMMISSION (1852), Evidence, p. 13.

18. "The Recent History of Professionalism in Relation to Social Structure and Social Policy," CANADIAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE 5 (1939): 325.

19. Philip Elliott, THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE PROFESSIONS (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972).

20. Ibid., p. 14.

21. See Arthur Engel, "Emerging Concepts of the Academic Profession at Oxford 1800-1845" in L. Stone, ed., THE UNIVERSITY IN SOCIETY, 2 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 1: 306-16 passim.

22. See A. J. Engel, FROM CLERGYMAN TO DON: THE RISE OF THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION IN NINETEENTH CENTURY OXFORD (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 167-73, 271-72.

23. See J. B. Atlay, HENRY ACLAND: A MEMOIR (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1903), p. 166 and pp. 165-66 passim.

24. MIDDLEMARCH (New York: Signet Classics Edition, 1964), esp. chap. 2, pp. 42-47.

25. Acland, as the son of a baronet, was also of higher social origins than most physicians of his day.

26. J. C. Jeaffreson, A BOOK OF RECOLLECTIONS, 2 vols. (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1894) 1: 25.

27. Ibid., 1: 26.

28. Ibid., 1: 24.

29. On the growing status of the medical profession in the nineteenth century, see M. Jeanne Peterson, THE MEDICAL PROFESSION IN VICTORIAN LONDON (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

30. Thomas Babington Macaulay, THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND FROM THE ACCESSION OF JAMES THE SECOND, 5 vols. (London: Longman and Co. 1863 ed.) 1: 305-6.

31. On the growth of professional education for naval officers, see Michael Lewis, ENGLAND'S SEA-OFFICERS: THE STORY OF THE NAVAL PROFESSION (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1939), esp. pp. 103-21.

32. J. A. Froude, NEMESIS OF FAITH (London: J. Chapman, 1849), p. 3.

33. Ibid., p. 5.

34. Ibid., p. 6.

35. Mrs. Humphrey Ward, "Miss Betherton," THE WRITINGS OF MRS. HUMPHREY WARD, Westmoreland Edition (London: Smith, Elder and Co.,

1911), 8: 244.

36. Cited by Vollmer and Mills eds., PROFESSIONALIZATION, p. v.

"Western" Colleges, 1830-1870: Educational Institutions in Transition

James Findlay

As America moved west throughout the nineteenth century people carried with them the ideas and institutions they had known and used in more settled areas further to the east. This was especially true of the system of higher education which began to develop in the upper Mississippi Valley in the second and third decades of the nineteenth century. Many Protestants from New England moved into Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois during those years. They immediately began to dot the landscape with private, religiously dominated liberal arts colleges which seemed to recapitulate the collegiate system that had gradually evolved in the preceding two centuries along the east coast.

There is ample evidence to confirm the claims of educational historians that even at their foundings the denominational colleges of the "west" were traditional institutions. Several of the colleges established in the 1830s in Indiana and Illinois, for example, were strongly influenced by the example of Yale and similar schools in New England.(1) Yale had always served as a

conservative bellweather, both in religious and educational circles. In 1828 the Yale faculty enhanced this reputation with the publication of the heralded Yale Report, which uncompromisingly defended the traditional college curriculum. The Report rejected any emphasis on practical studies, stressing instead those subjects which would "discipline the mind," namely, Greek, Latin, mathematics, and moral philosophy.(2)

Many Yale graduates became home missionaries in the interior. Illinois College was founded in 1828 by such a "Yale Band." Six years later supporters of Illinois College and graduates of Dartmouth, a sister institution to Yale, were central figures in establishing Wabash College in Indiana. An examination of the early catalogues of the seven colleges included in this study reveals the similarity of their basic collegiate programs and the traditional, largely unchanging, nature of their college-level curricula throughout the pre-Civil War years.(3) The influence of the Yale Report and the classical curriculum seemed to remain undiminished throughout the antebellum era, and reflected perhaps most clearly the deeply conservative nature of these frontier colleges.

In recent years, however, a new generation of historians of higher education has been trying to modify our understanding of the antebellum liberal arts college. These historians have suggested that these institutions were often abreast of current scientific developments and incorporated such into their curricula, were sensitive to the educational needs and

demands of local constituencies which were a primary source of organizational and financial support, and provided an effective means of social and economic mobility for the hundreds of students they trained between 1830 and 1870.(4)

The archival records of the midwestern colleges included in this study provide much evidence to corroborate the arguments of the revisionist historians. These records show clearly that the fledgling western schools tinkered constantly with their curricular offerings. They provided practical training for school teachers and thus an alternative to the system of "normal schools" emerging in the midwest by the mid-nineteenth century. They created separate "science departments": programs of study which paralleled the classical curriculum, and often attracted more students than the latter, and stressed modern languages and incorporated into the curriculum key aspects of modern science. Finally, by the 1860s they embraced co-education, a decision reflecting in part the semi-egalitarian society which surrounded them. Co-education was also a social practice which set these schools distinctively apart from their eastern counterparts.(5)

A variant on the themes just suggested occurred in the struggle to establish a state-supported system of higher education in Indiana and Illinois prior to 1870. By examining this controversy in some detail from the perspective of the private colleges, we can see clearly both the underlying religious (and conservative) assumptions upon which these institutions operated and

their willingness to be flexible and pragmatic when faced with demands for change. The elucidation of this theme is the central concern of the remainder of this essay.

The need for "agricultural education," expressed early in the history of these midwestern schools, serves as an appropriate starting point for our discussion. Agricultural education in the midwest in the 1830s and 1840s meant different things to different people. In simplest form it involved an exchange of information about new or improved techniques to be applied to all aspects of farming. Such an attitude lay behind the proliferation of local and state agricultural societies throughout the country that began early in the nineteenth century. It also helps to explain the rapid growth at the same time of the so-called agricultural press, and the publication of an increasing number of manuals and handbooks dealing with specific aspects of farming.

On a more sophisticated level a form of vocational education was in the making. People perceived that organized bodies of knowledge, the natural sciences in particular and the methods used to expand knowledge in those sciences, could be applied to the practice of agriculture. A few private elementary and secondary schools on the east coast began experimenting with practical and scientific study in agriculture in the 1820s and 1830s. Thereafter the movement spread to the midwest.(6)

In March 1840 some of the trustees of Shurtleff

College attempted to justify for the people of Illinois the creation of an agricultural department at their institution. We need "more knowledge of the best methods of cultivating and manuring" to combat the fact that "our soils are annually exhausting and our crops diminishing," they exclaimed.

> Our domestic animals of all sorts constantly sicken and die of diseases and accidents... which might be greatly diminshed by more extensive information of the anatomy and diseases of these animals. Our fruits, grains and grasses, are annually the prey of unknown diseases or noxious insects...which might be prevented by a more intimate acquaintance with the laws of vegetation and the character and habit of these insects.(7)

These words suggested how the immediate problems of an agricultural community might be solved through empirical investigation of the "laws" of plants, through study of the "habits" of "noxious insects," and by developing precise "information" concerning "the anatomy and diseases" of domestic animals. Clearly the fusion of scientific technique and agricultural practice had become a concern of the private colleges.

But publicly expressed concern did not translate itself into concrete programs. Between 1840 and 1860 McKendree, Franklin, Wabash, Knox, and Shurtleff all evidenced enthusiastic discussion about establishing programs of agricultural education, yet only Franklin

and Wabash brought their plans even to partial fruition. At Wabash this meant offering a brief course on "Practical Agriculture" during the summer term, which lasted only a year or so after its inception in 1848. Franklin's efforts were a bit more elaborate -- a department of agriculture, initiated in 1853 — but this program, too, soon disappeared.(8) Perhaps the colleges were too far ahead of the times with these innovations. The precise subject matter was unclear. Who was to teach the new courses? A chemist, perhaps, or a botanist, or even a mathematician. Each of these alternatives was suggested or tried. At Knox there was even a suggestion to call one of the proposed instructors the "Professor of the Green Earth!" There were also the inevitable questions as to how much of their slim economic resources the colleges could commit to such risky educational ventures. And we know now that in the 1840s and 1850s broad public support for advanced education of any sort developed slowly in Indiana and Illinois.(9) The colleges had to help create the necessary public backing, and that took time.

Nevertheless, the idea of agricultural education, a form of popular education, did not disappear in the midwest when the religiously-controlled colleges faltered in their efforts to develop such programs. By the 1850s a network of local agricultural societies had been created in Illinois. Through these societies farmers met regularly at state and county agricultural fairs and held annual statewide conventions where they shared information and views about their work. They began to sense their political potential and to

organize as a lobby of sorts favoring the development of agricultural education. An expanding agricultural press, led by the now-famous Prairie Farmer, founded in 1844, also served as a forum for and disseminator of ideas about agricultural education. In 1851 at one of the state conventions of the agricultural societies, Jonathan Baldwin Turner crystallized many of the earliest thoughts about education and agriculture by presenting proposals for the establishment of an "Industrial University" serving principally agricultural and mechanical, or industrial, workers in the state.(10)

Turner had taught for over a decade at Illinois College, but his unorthodox views, especially on religion, eventually forced him to resign. He continued to live in Jacksonville, however, developing a growing interest in the application of science to agriculture and making his large farm something of a demonstration laboratory.(11) Turner was principally a publicist and propagandist. His plan for a state university served more as a rallying cry and topic for discussion than a proposal to be implemented immediately into law. But his arguments clearly raised questions about the future of higher education in Illinois.

As rumblings about the possible creation of a state university agitated the state from time to time, officials and supporters of the private colleges viewed all such movements with great suspicion. The issues at stake extended far beyond the location of an appropriate forum for the teaching of courses related

to the professions, agriculture and the mechanical arts. If a tax-supported state institution came into existence, it would immediately create an alternative system of higher education to that of the evangelicals -- egalitarian in its social base, potentially well financed, and above all not controlled by the churches.

The evangelicals had always viewed church related colleges and the close connection of those institutions to the educational system in general as the keys to their efforts to "Christianize society," to bring first the Mississippi Valley and then the entire nation under the direct sway of God's moral law and divine approbation. Education at all times was to be the handmaiden of religion. The western colleges, created and controlled by the major Protestant denominations, were to be key building blocks in the entire educational system of the Mississippi Valley. They were to provide teachers for the common schools and leaders of the larger community of the region who would assure essential support for that system.(12) A state university, in Illinois or elsewhere, challenged that basic evangelical motivation in the most direct manner possible.

In 1850 President Julian Sturtevant of Illinois College, writing to a close friend at the time of Jonathan Turner's public proclamation of his state "industrial" university, revealed these evangelical attitudes: "One of the great powers which the friends of Christian education have to guard against is--the dissevering of our Christian Colleges from the common school systems of the states in which they are

located." Evangelical Christians, he noted, called the church-sponsored colleges "the 'heart' of the common school system--the 'illuminating center,' etc.," and in New England, especially, people "understood these relationships because there were no State Institutions to claim such relations." But beginning with normal schools, which were now "the rage," the tendency "to usurp the place so long held by our Colleges in our educational system . . . will be felt more and more in the west as the several states in addition to Normal Schools should have Universities alongside of such institutions as are aided by (the churches).(13)

Thus, it was that in 1846 John Mason Peck, a leader in the efforts to found Shurtleff College and probably the most influential Baptist in Illinois before 1850, worried openly about talk of "raising a University in this state," even though correctly surmising that raising the $100,000 thought necessary to support such an institution was "rather a doubtful business." Less than two years later another publicly discussed plan of a similar nature caused the Methodists at McKendree to develop an elaborate counterproposal for a state university consisting of all the private colleges tied together by an executive board consisting of the presidents of these same colleges. Julian Sturtevant believed (falsely) that his school would become the state university in 1847. He made public suggestions again along the same lines in 1849, and, as Jonathan Turner began to proclaim his university scheme in 1850, Sturtevant sought to combat this idea with proposals for the adoption of a statewide tax-supported student scholarship program

applicable at all the private colleges and similar to one just enacted in Massachusetts. In 1852, at a state agricultural society convention in Springfield, Illinois, representatives of the religious colleges, led by the president of Shurtleff, attended the convention and tried to unsuccessfully prevent adoption of resolutions supporting Turner's separate industrial university.(14) Throughout the 1850s any proposed alternative to the existing colleges met instant opposition from evangelical Protestants in Illinois.

Close examination of the evidence, however, suggests that the private colleges played something of a double role in these debates over the nature of higher education in the midwest. Fundamentally they took a conservative position, seeking to protect their own standing as the group in control of college training and as defenders of the traditional liberal arts curriculum. Yet, they also contributed leaders such as Jonathan Turner to the efforts to establish an alternative system of higher education. The first president of Illinois University, John Milton Gregory, came to that office from the presidency of Kalamazoo College, a Baptist school in Michigan. The first superintendent of public instruction in Illinois, Newton Bateman, who worked enthusiastically for the establishment of the state university, was one of the earliest graduates of Illinois College, and in the 1870s the president of Knox College.(15)

It was hard to disentangle the private colleges from the beginnings of the institutions that ultimately challenged them and their educational leadership. This

was primarily because the sectarian schools were essentially the only source of experience and expertise in higher education in the midwest at the time of these debates. It was, therefore, inevitable that they be called upon to help as the new universities took shape. And the private schools had tried in limited ways to respond to pressures for democratizing education. This made it possible for some of their supporters to espouse also the cause of the more democratic state universities. The private colleges, then, stood in a unique and ambivalent position--opponents of the state universities, yet ironically also contributors to their establishment and early history.

In Indiana events developed somewhat differently. Hoosier lawmakers had incorporated a state-supported institution of higher education in 1820, just four years after Indiana entered the Union. The school, located at Bloomington, officially became a "college" and then a "university" in 1838. But these increasingly imposing changes in title did not hide the fact that for many years the state institution was little more than another denominational college. The first president and the early faculty were all ordained Presbyterian ministers. Presbyterians throughout the state had no doubts that the college at Bloomington was one of their institutions. Often in the 1830s it was lumped together in people's minds with the other formally recognized Presbyterian colleges in the state, Hanover and Wabash.(16) Non-Presbyterians perceived matters the same way. Indiana Methodists, upset over their lack of influence with the board of trustees and faculty at Bloomington, threatened to and then did

found a neighboring college of their own. Indiana Asbury came into existence in 1837 in part because of the seemingly unfair control of the state university by the Presbyterians. In 1860 Cyrus Nutt, a Methodist and former president of Indiana Asbury, became president of the university, but this still did not change the popular view of the school as little more than a sectarian college.(17)

Cast in the image of the private schools, over the years the university was all but ignored by the people of the state. A new state constitution drafted in 1850-51 made no mention of the school. In 1852 one of the two houses of the state legislature favored diverting to the common school fund a major part of the legally insured income of the university. In 1853 the school had only two graduates and a budget of $6,000, less than comparable figures for several of the private schools in the state at the time. Not until 1867 and after did the state legislature begin to approve annual appropriations which assured the relative financial stability of Indiana University.

From time to time the university made efforts to create a normal school, establish a law professorship, and affiliate with a private medical school in Indianapolis; but none of these experiments lasted long. In the 1850s talk of establishing an agricultural college in connection with the university at Bloomington produced little. Although agricultural societies and a nascent agricultural press had developed, as in Illinois, there was no one comparable to Jonathan Turner to provide a plan of action with a

propagandist's skills around which to organize a public campaign for agricultural education.(18) Public apathy toward education generally, evident both in Illinois and Indiana throughout the pre-Civil War era, seemed more firmly entrenched in the latter state, and these popular attitudes deeply affected the early history of Indiana University. It remained primarily a liberal arts college until well after the Civil War. These facts may also explain why in the 1850s the leaders of the private colleges of Indiana, in contrast to similar groups in Illinois, seemed unconcerned about possible threats from state supported schools to their dominance of higher education, and devoted little or no time thinking about how they might respond if such a threat suddenly materialized.

In 1862 the federal government passed the Morrill Land Grant Act, which impinged immediately upon all the private colleges in Indiana and Illinois. The product of lengthy national debate and agitation among a wide variety of special interest groups seeking federal support for agricultural and mechanical education, the Morrill Act provided that eligible states would receive 30,000 acres of public land (or negotiable script in lieu of the land) for each member of the state's congressional delegation. The proceeds from the sale of this public land would provide a permanent endowment for "at least one college" (thus, the law did not exclude more than one school, to the delight of the private colleges) where the "leading object shall be . . . to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanics arts."(19)

By means of the Morrill Act formula Indiana was to receive 390,000 acres and Illinois 470,000 acres of public land. Politicians in both states decided almost immediately to accept the proffered gift and then wrangled among themselves for a number of years as to how it was to be divided. At one time or another in both states the religiously controlled colleges tried to secure the endowment. The economic stakes were very great; but equally important, the threat of an alternative collegiate system, heretofore only implicit, was now explicit and close to reality.

In Indiana the private colleges made several attempts to control the disbursement of funds. Probably the most serious effort came in 1864 when Wabash, Indiana Asbury, Hanover, and Northwestern Christian University (a college founded in 1855 and operated by the Disciples of Christ) agreed on a plan to lobby jointly in the legislature for the creation of an "agricultural college" with its central offices in Indianapolis (centrally located and the state capitol) but with professorships of "Agricultural and Mechanical Philosophy and Military Science" assigned to each of the sponsoring colleges. Instruction would take place at each of the schools, research and "public lectures" at the center in Indianapolis. John Campbell, a faculty member at Wabash and the principal author of the plan, was freed from academic duties to go to the state capitol and lobby for the proposal.(20) The legislature, however, eventually rejected this plan, and the private schools failed thereafter to develop any other effective proposals. The establishment of Purdue University at Lafayette in 1869 finally ended

the dispute once and for all.

If the denominational colleges were truly to cooperate and share the Morrill Act monies and the accompanying academic programs, their proposals had to embrace a decentralized system that included some or all of the private schools. Such a system would be expensive to run and administratively far less effective than a single university, a telling argument made by the president of Indiana University, Cyrus Nutt, in 1865 as he sought to rebut the claims of the private colleges and advance the candidacy of his own school.(21)

This same difficulty also plagued the leaders of the private colleges in Illinois as they struggled to develop a workable educational proposal on the basis of shared responsibility. In 1863 Knox and Shurtleff joined forces and proposed to the legislature that agricultural schools for the northern and southern parts of the state be established under their jurisdiction. Effective lobbying almost secured passage of this bill, but the Assembly adjourned for the year without taking final action. Much later, in 1867, the evangelical schools made a final try. At a truly ecumenical gathering in Chicago in October of that year representatives of eight colleges from five denominations met and created a program that paralleled in some ways the plan of the private colleges in Indiana. A professor of agriculture attached to each of the separate faculties was to offer courses in agriculture education. This Illinois plan lacked a central research center, which made it even more

vulnerable to criticism.(22)

A concern for decentralization dominated all the discussions of the evangelicals in Illinois whenever they considered the possibility of a state university. This was true of the Methodists at McKendree as they debated the idea in 1848; it was a central concern of Julian Sturtevant as he mused privately about the same question in the 1850s; and it shaped the concrete proposals the evangelicals advanced in the 1860s as they tried to secure Morrill Act funds. This emphasis was the inevitable result of the peculiar problems the evangelicals faced among themselves. It meant, however, that they always had to rely on a vulnerable organizational idea that never found acceptance from either the legislatures or the people of Illinois and Indiana.

There was one important exception to these comments. Officials of Illinois College did not attend the meeting in Chicago in 1867, nor did they endorse the proposals made there. By that date the College was prepared to bid by itself to become the state university. It was a bold effort, worked out in conjunction with the community leaders of Morgan County, where the school was located. Competing with other communities in the state for the now eagerly sought after prize of the university, Jacksonville and Morgan county offered the legislature a "package" of land, personal pledges, and other resources valued at almost $500,000. At the heart of this package was Illinois College with all its assets.

Developed chiefly by Julian Sturtevant with strong backing from Jonathan Baldwin Turner, the Illinois College proposal differed significantly from those advanced by the other private colleges. The other plans had merely added a professorship of agriculture education to already established liberal arts curricula, thereby maintaining the predominance of traditional academic concerns. Such an arrangement was in reality a violation of the provisions of the Morrill Act which stated that the "leading object" of the school or schools awarded the endowment was to be training in agricultural and mechanical education.(23) The Illinois College plan envisioned the college itself as only one part of a much larger university emphasizing practical agricultural education, exactly as the Morrill Act requested. In essence the college would be totally absorbed by the new institution. The trustees of the school made clear in the records of their deliberations what they sought to do:

> The Trustees of Illinois College offer and agree that, in the event said University shall be located at Jacksonville, Illinois College shall be and become a Department or one College in the proposed University, and the said Trustees of Illinois College will dedicate its said property and funds to the uses of the University, in conformity with the true design and scope of the Act of Congress above referred to (the Morrill Act), by a conveyance to the University of the 31 acres of land on which Illinois College is located, and the

> Library, Apparatus etc of the College, and place the College itself under the regulation and government of the Regents of the University, and surrender to the University the right of conferring degrees, subject only to the condition that such regulations and government shall not materially prevent or interfere with the legal . . . administration of the trusts confided to the Trustees of Illinois College.(24)

Severe economic problems facing the college help to explain why Sturtevant and his supporters pressed this plan. Declining enrollments in the 1860s, accentuated by the Civil War, had caused a period of extreme economic stress. Full access to the endowment monies created by the Morrill Act would solve those difficulties immediately. Moreover, Illinois College would find itself at the heart of the new university, and thereby it could effectively protect the interests of evangelical religion even though its separate identity as a college ended. This fact would greatly ease the long-held worries of Sturtevant and other evangelicals over the prospects of a future where state-supported schools without formal religious connections were free gradually to slip their moorings in evangelical faith and practice. Sturtevant himself articulated both the worries and the intended solution in 1864:

> It seems timely that such a State University with such a conservative element as our College occupying a

> permanent place in it from its birth and giving (it) its first character cannot fail to be a blessing to millions yet unborn, . . . a great state University founded in the hearts and the confidence of a great people and possessing . . . the broadest democratic functions.(25)

Sturtevant's program failed eventually because the politicians representing Champaign-Urbana were more effective in manipulating the levers of influence and power in the state legislature than were the people representing Jacksonville and Morgan County. The welter of opportunism and shameless boosterism that characterized the last stages of that process, in which the religiously-controlled colleges fully participated, meant that thoughtful consideration of educational alternatives nearly disappeared from the debate.(26) Yet despite flaws in the effort, the existing religious institutions of higher education in the midwest had been forced to think quite a bit about their raison d'etre and to define once again their relationship to the constantly changing larger society of which they were a part. And in the light of historical circumstances and the ideological assumptions upon which he acted, Julian Sturtevant's ideas concerning an "industrial university" were undoubtedly the most creative and realistic of all the schemes developed by the evangelicals in either Indiana or Illinois.

The struggle at the local level over how to implement the Morrill Act was only one part of numerous efforts beginning by 1870 to reshape American higher

education. There were attempts among the private colleges in Indiana and Illinois to engage in such fundamental debate about the purposes of higher education and about the future of specific colleges quite apart from the issue of agricultural education. The movement toward coeducation came to full fruition in the midwest simultaneously with the debate over the Morrill Act and in many of the same colleges. In the mid-1860s Illinois College achieved a thorough revision of its curriculum in a manner that anticipated to some degree the movement toward a free elective system supposedly initiated by prestigious eastern schools such as Brown and Harvard. In 1870 the trustees of Shurtleff College seriously discussed a detailed proposal to transform their school into a university embracing men's and women's colleges of arts and sciences, a college of the Bible, a college of law, and an industrial college "designed to advance agriculture, mechanical and other useful arts," and the existing preparatory school or academy of the college. About the same time, the president of Wabash, sensing that change was in the air, spent several weeks touring major private institutions in the east, then returned home to Indiana to reflect on the implications for the future of his own small college of what he saw and heard. His conclusions reaffirmed the importance of the traditional liberal arts college and the "Higher Culture" such colleges nurtured in their students. This was a more conservative response than in the other instances cited, but it was no less a reflection of the temper of the times.(27)

In their own ways the evangelical Protestant

colleges actively participated in the broad effort to relate American higher education to the new society emerging as the forces of technology, industrialism, and science came to dominate the modern world. Until recently educational historians have thought that the denominational colleges were largely irrelevant to this struggle. By studying the history of certain mid-western colleges prior to 1870, it is possible to see that these small institutions were helping to create, in matters such as curricular change and coeducation, educational ideas and practices upon which the later university system often relied. Not all of these early experiments succeeded. Some were ill-conceived, most were poorly funded, one or two were perhaps too far ahead of their time.

In the 1860s these same schools also participated vigorously in the much broader and more fundamental discussion over the nature of higher education triggered by the passage of the Morrill Act. Here, too, the private colleges for the most part were cautious and conservative, and their proposals were rejected. But by posing concrete programs and alternatives to the system of university education finally adopted, they helped to clarify the nature of this important debate and pushed the public, in Indiana and Illinois at least, toward a final decision. In any case, historians should no longer ignore the real contributions these private, sectarian colleges made to American higher education before 1870, the considerable realism they developed in struggling to relate to a raw, half-formed western society, and the clear connections that existed between their tentative

efforts at innovation and change and the new arrangements in higher education emerging permanently in the last third of the nineteenth century.

Footnotes

1. The principal conclusions of this paper are based on intensive research into the archival records of seven colleges located in Indiana and Illinois: Knox, Illinois, McKendree, and Shurtleff Colleges in Illinois; and Wabash and Franklin Colleges, and Indiana Asbury (later DePauw) University in Indiana. The writer selected these colleges for study because they all were founded in the late 1820s or in the 1830s and thus possess a common time frame and geographic location, because there are substantial archival materials still available, and because the seven schools represent the four major Protestant denominations -- Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, and Presbyterian -- which played a central role in establishing the numerous liberal arts colleges still scattered throughout the upper Mississippi Valley.

2. A helpful summary of the Yale Report, indicating its significance in ensuring the vitality of the classical liberal arts curriculum during the nineteenth century, is in George P. Schmidt, THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE: A CHAPTER IN AMERICAN CULTURAL HISTORY (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1957, pp. 54-58. An edited version of the Report is reprinted in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 1: 275-91.

3. See Theron Baldwin, "Historical Sketch of the Origin, Progress and Wants of Illinois College," pamphlet in Illinois College Archives; SEMI-CENTENNIAL WEEK AT WABASH COLLEGE, JUNE,

1982 (Crawfordsville, Ind., 1882), pamphlet in Wabash College Archives. A sampling of relevant college catalogues concerning curricular offerings includes: Knox College Catalogue, 1848 to 1855; Illinois College Catalogue, 1833-34, 1863-64; McKendree College Annual Catalogue, 1837, 1858; and Indiana Asbury University Catalogue, 1840, 1858-59.

4. Stanley Guralnick, SCIENCE AND THE ANTE-BELLUM COLLEGE (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1975); David Potts, "College Enthusiasm as Public Response, 1800-1360," HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW 47 (February 1977): 28-42; David F. Allmendinger, PAUPERS AND SCHOLARS: THE TRANSFORMATION OF STUDENTS LIFE IN NINETEENTH CENTURY NEW ENGLAND (New York: St. Martins Press, 1975); and especially James McLachlan, "The American College in the Nineteenth Century: Towards a Reappraisal," TEACHERS COLLEGE RECORD 80 (December 1978): 287-306; and Colin B. Burke, AMERICAN COLLEGIATE POPULATION: A TEST OF THE TRADITIONAL VIEW (New York: New York University Press, 1982).

5. On curriculum adjustments made for common school teachers, see Wabash College, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 25 March 1834; and Illinois College, Minutes of the Faculty, Meeting of 8 July 1836. Information on "scientific departments" will be found in Codman Hislop, ELIPHALET NOTT (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1971), pp. 120-33; Indiana Asbury University, Catalogue, 1840, pp. 11-13, and 1864-65, p. 15; McKendree College, Catalogue, 1854, p. 15; and Knox College, Catalogue, 1847-48. Figures comparing scientific and classical department enrollments are in Indiana Asbury University, Catalogues, 1851-55; and Shurtleff College, Catalogue, 1856-57. For coeducation see Knox College, "Records of the Preparatory and Female Collegiate Departments at Knox College,

1840-1870," folder in the archives; and Hermann Muelder, "Women at Knox," (Typewritten, in possession of the writer); Indiana Asbury University, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meetings of 14 July 1857, 28 August 1860, 25 July 1861, 21 June 1865, 26 June 1867, 24 June 1868, and 28 June 1869; and ASBURY REVIEW, 2 October and 12 December 1867, and 9 January 1868.

6. Alfred C. True, A HISTORY OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1785-1925 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929), pp. 23-44; and Albert L. Demaree, THE AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL PRESS, 1819-1860 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941). For a succinct summary of the forces leading to the expansion of scientific, technological, and practical forms of advanced education in the mid-nineteenth century, see Winton Solberg, THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1867-1894: AN INTELLECTUAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1968), pp. 22-58.

7. BAPTIST BANNER AND WESTERN PIONEER, 2 April 1840, p. 1.

8. McKendree College, JOURNAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MCKENDREE COLLEGE EDUCATIONAL CONVENTION, . . . FEBRUARY 20-21, 1868 (Alton, Ill.: S.V. Crossman, 1868), pp. 45-46; Franklin College, "Report to the Board of Trustees of Franklin College on Changes in the Course of Study, April 6, 1853," pp. 12-13, pamphlet included in bound volume of Catalogues, 1846-84, Franklin College Archives, and Franklin College Catalogue, 1853-54, p. 11; Wabash College, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 18 July 1848, and Catalogue of 1848-49, p. 17; Knox College, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 14 December 1848 and 21 June 1854; and BAPTIST BANNER AND WESTERN PIONEER, 2 April 1840, p. 1, and 9 April 1840, p.1.

9. Franklin College, "Report to the Board of Trustees," p. 13; Knox College, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 18 December 1848; Judith A. Hancock, "Jonathan Baldwin Turner (1805-1899): A Study of an Educational Reformer" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1971), pp. 145-49; Solberg, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, pp. 47-53; and Emma Lou Thornbrough, INDIANA IN THE CIVIL WAR ERA, 1850-1880 (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1965), pp. 506-10.

10. Interest in agricultural education was not limited to the midwest. Even in rapidly industrializing New England support for programs of this sort strongly manifested itself. In the 1850s at Yale, bastion of traditional academic activities, students could take courses in agricultural education in the recently established Sheffield Scientific School. (The Sheffield School was an interesting parallel to the scientific departments developing in the western colleges). In part because of its established program in agricultural education, Yale became the first land grant institution in Connecticut, and remained so until the early 1890s. Brooks M. Kelley, YALE: A HISTORY (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1974), pp. 183-84, 189; Walter Stemmons, CONNECTICUT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE: A HISTORY (Storrs, Conn.: Connecticut Agricultural College, 1931), pp. 58-77. For similar developments in other New England states, see Harold W. Cary, THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS: A HISTORY OF ONE HUNDRED YEARS (Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1962), pp. 1-37; Herman Eschenbacher, THE UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND: A HISTORY OF LAND GRANT EDUCATION IN RHODE ISLAND (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1967), pp. 1-59.

11. Julian M. Sturtevant to Theron Baldwin, 12

March, 19 May, 1 July, 23 September, 27 October 1846, and 26 June 1847, Sturtevant-Baldwin Correspondence, Illinois College Archives; Hancock, "Jonathan B. Turner," chaps. 2-4.

12. These attitudes were widely held among evangelical Protestants, both in the midwest and in the east. A sampling of the possible documentation might include: Methodist Church, Illinois Conference, Journal, 11 September 1844; Byrum Lawrence to Jesse Holman, 19 May 1832, Holman Correspondence, Franklin College Archives; Caleb Mills to brother, 12, 16, 22 February 1844, Caleb Mills Collection, Indiana Historical Society; QUARTER CENTURY CELEBRATION AT ILLINOIS COLLEGE: HISTORICAL DISCOURSE BY THE PRESIDENT, REV. J. M. STURTEBANT, D.D. . . . JULY 11, 1855 (NEW YORK, 1855), pamphlet in Illinois College Archives.

13. Sturtevant to Baldwin, 31 December 1850, Sturtevant-Baldwin Correspondence.

14. John M. Peck to Rufus Babcock, 4 April 1846, J. M. Peck Collection, American Baptist Historical Society, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School; LEBANON (ILL.) JOURNAL, 9 December 1847, 6 April 1848, 9 November 1848; Sturtevant to Baldwin, 30 March and 19 May 1847, 31 December 1850, and 1 February 1854, Sturtevant-Baldwin Correspondence; and THE PRAIRIE FARMER, August, 1852, pp. 380-82, January, 1853, p. 6, September, 1853, pp. 326-27.

15. Harry A. Kersey, JOHN MILTON GREGORY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1968), pp. 1-87; Charles H. Rammelkamp, ILLINOIS COLLEGE: A CENTENNIAL HISTORY, 1829-1929 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1928), pp. 83-84, 193; and William B. Simonds, NEWTON BATEMAN (Galesburg, Ill., 1930), p. 16.

16. John M. Ellis to E. O. Hovey, 11 January 1833, Elbridge Howe to THE BOSTON RECORDER, 23 April 1835, E. O. Hovey Letters, Wabash College Archives; Wabash College, excerpts from Minutes of the Board of Trustees, n. d. but probably 1833, #7, Ormes Folder, See also Wabash College, Minutes of the Prudential Committee, Meeting of 9 August 1856, and Minutes of the Faculty, Meeting of 11 July 1838.

17. James A. Woodburn, HISTORY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY, 1820-1902 (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1940), pp. 3-124, 251-65.

18. Thornbrough, INDIANA IN THE CIVIL WAR ERA, pp. 506-8, 509, 394-97; and Thomas D. Clark, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, MIDWESTERN PIONEER: THE EARLY YEARS (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1970), pp. 81-82, 83-84, 116-117.

19. For discussion of the historical background to the Morrill Act, see Earle D. Ross, DEMOCRACY'S COLLEGE: THE LAND-GRANT MOVEMENT IN THE FORMATIVE STATE (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1942), pp. 1-67; and especially revealing for Illinois, Solberg, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, pp. 22-58. There was, of course, great interest aroused in both private and public educational circles in the eastern states by the Morrill Act. See note 10, above.

20. Wabash College, Minutes of the Prudential Committee, Meeting of 29 June 1878; and Indiana Asbury University, Minutes of the Faculty, Meeting of 11 October 1864. Northwestern Christian University initiated several proposals by itself in the early stages of maneuvering over the endowment. Situated in Indianapolis, this school could use its proximity to the legislature and geographical location in the middle of the state to good advantage. There were also later proposals from the sectarian

institutions, but none succeeded. William M. Hepburn and Louis M. Sears, PURDUE UNIVERSITY: FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS (Indianapolis: Hollenback Press, 1925), pp. 27-29; and Indiana Asbury University, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 15 January 1867.

21. Woodburn, HISTORY OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY, pp. 272-77.

22. Solberg, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, pp. 61, 74-75.

23. Winton Solberg first noted this important point. see Ibid., p. 60.

24. Illinois College, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meeting of 5 February 1867 (emphasis added). Detailed accounts of the evolution of the Illinois College proposal are available in Travis Hedrick, "Julian Monson Sturtevant and the Moral Machinery of Society" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brown University, 1974), chap. 12; and Rammelkamp, ILLINOIS COLLEGE, pp. 231-41.

25. Sturtevant to Baldwin, 21 December 1864, Sturtevant-Baldwin Correspondence.

26. For details of the almost larger-than-life events which finally determined the location of the university, see Solberg, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, pp. 75-80; and Donald H. Doyle, THE SOCIAL ORDER OF A FRONTIER COMMUNITY: JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS, 1825-1870 (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1978), pp. 249-55.

27. Rammelkamp, ILLINOIS COLLEGE, pp. 243-45; PLAN OF AN UNIVERSITY SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SHURTLEFF COLLEGE AT THEIR ANNUAL MEETING, JUNE 7, 1870 . . . (Alton, Ill., 1870), pamphlet in the Illinois State Historical Library; Shurtleff College, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Meetings of 9 June, 30 August, and 17 November 1870; and Wabash College Archives,

Joseph F. Tuttle, THE HIGHER CULTURE: ITS NATURE, POSITION, METHOD AND PATRONS: BEING A BACCALAUREATE DISCOURSE DELIVERED AT WABASH COLLEGE . . . JUNE 23rd, 1872 (Newark, N.J. 1872), and "A Visit to Four Eastern Colleges," n.p., n.d., pamphlets in Tuttle Scrapbooks, vol. 2. The planned institutional changes at Shurtleff were never implemented, primarily because of inadequate financing.

The Mental Hygiene Movement and the Development of Personality: Changing Conceptions of the American College and University, 1920-1940

Sol Cohen

Though the mental hygiene movement has aroused considerable interest among historians in recent years, its impact on American education has not yet received the scholarly attention it deserves.(1) (2) This paper describes the attempt by the mental hygiene movement to gain a foothold in the colleges and universities. The initial objective or the psychiatrists who led the movement was to persuade the colleges and universities to establish a psychiatric or mental hygiene service for students with "problems of adjustment." Once this service was established, their objectives became more ambitious--to make personality development the guiding principle of American higher education, to disseminate the "mental hygiene point of view" throughout the campus community, and to become moral tutors of the college youth of America.

This paper deals with a small group of little-known psychiatrists who were instrumental in securing mental hygiene services for college and university students. Although their goal was neither

to enhance the presitige nor increase the numbers of non-medical psychologists or counselors on the campuses, by securing mental hygiene services in fact they did. Their ideas about the purpose of higher education are as provocative as and more fresh than those of the better known figures in college and university reform in the twenties and thirties such as Babbitt, Flexner, or Hutchins. Some of their ideas are strikingly modern, anticipating by more than thirty years conceptions of the college and university proposed by Nevitt Sanford and his associates in the sixties.(3)

By nature of its subject matter this paper enters into current revisionist debates about reform movements in general and psychiatry in particular. Since the ultimate goal of the hygienists was not simply to provide a new service for students but to disseminate the "mental hygiene point of view" as widely as possible, this paper also touches on a broader phenomenon. Its subject matter intersects with current analyses of the infiltration of psychiatric authority and psychiatric categories of thought, discourse, and value into all aspects of American life in this century.(4) Finally, the whole question of the professionalization of psychiatry bears heavily on the subject of this paper. Full understanding of the mental hygiene movement in higher education would require an interprofessional history of psychiatry, psychology, and mental hygiene, as well as higher education. This paper is intended as a suggestive and exploratory sketch.

II

Turn-of-the century America and the Progressive Movement comprise the matrix from which the mental hygiene movement emerged. The mental hygiene movement was part of the many-faceted effort to come to grips with life in urban, industrial, multi-cultural society. The National Committee for Mental Hygiene (NCMH) was organized in 1909 by a small group of reform-minded academicians, social workers, physicians, and psychiatrists. Prominent among the lay persons who took part in the early years of the NCMH were William James, Julia Lathrop, and the Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., as well as Clifford Beers, founder of the movement and author of the inspirational and path-breaking memoir, A MIND THAT FOUND ITSELF (1908). A small group of "psychiatric progressives," led by Adolf Meyer and including August Hoch, Stewart Paton, and William Alanson White provided the movement's early medical leadership.(5)

Inspired by advances in the field of public health, especially the campaign against tuberculosis, hygienists were eager to launch an aggressive campaign against mental illiness. But funds were difficult to obtain; and the general therapeutic pessimism regarding the mentally ill, characteristic of late nineteenth and early twentieth century American psychiatry and medicine, was hard to combat. By the 1920s, however, the scope of the NCMH had grown considerably, expanding from a concern with insanity and mental deficiency to include, in White's words, "all forms of social maladjustment and even unhappiness," and to extend well

beyond the confines of the hospital and the mental asylum to agencies having to do with individual and social welfare.

The theoretical basis for the optimism and crusading zeal which characterized the mental hygiene movement in the 1920s was formulated in the pre-World War I period out of such diverse sources as Meyer's "psychobiology" or eclectic psychiatry of "the whole person", John B. Watson's Behaviorism, and psychoanalytic concepts extrapolated from Freud as well as, in lesser degree, from Jung and Adler. Its hopes rested on a new conception of mental illness which placed the emphasis on "personality" and which for practical purposes chose to disregard heredity or organic damage.

Mental illness, according to the hygienists, was not a "disease" of the brain or nervous system, but a personality disorder.(6) Mental illness referred to disorders of the personality confronting the stresses of life. Disorders of personality were not only responsible for individual suffering but social problems like delinquency, crime, dependency, and industrial unrest. However, the fundamental working assumption of the mental hygiene movement was that, personality was basically malleable.(7) Belief in the malleability of personality led the hygienists to optimism regarding treatment and cure of mental illness, and inspired their belief in prevention.

The strategic institution for the practice of mental hygiene was the school. The psychiatric point of view was expressed by NCMH Medical Director Thomas

W. Salmon in 1917: "psychiatrists...must be permitted to enter the schools."(8) The hygienists' therapeutic imperialism, cautious at first, gradually grew stronger. The main focus of hygienist attention before the War were children in the grade schools. But by the twenties, the same principles of personality development were viewed as valid for youth in college or university as for younger children. Hygienist experience during World War I was crucial for this change in focus. In the spring of 1917, when the U.S. entered the War, the NCMH concentrated its efforts on organizing the psychiatric service for the armed forces. Salmon became Director of Neuropsychiatry for the American Expeditionary Force, winning by his efforts much acclaim for dynamic psychiatry, psychoanalyis, and the NCMH. The psychiatrists' experience with the so-called "shell shock" cases provided convincing evidence for the role of personality disorders in mental illness. Soldiers developed severe organic or physical symptons like tremors, tics, and hallucinations. But frequently such symptoms had no neurological or organic basis, they were "psychoneuroses" or personality disorders.(9)

Their experience in treating the war neuroses confirmed the hygienists' belief in the psychological nature of mental illness. Most personality disorders might have their roots in childhood, but maladjustments could arise from precipitating events in adult life and, more important, could be ameliorated or even cured in adulthood. There was another lesson drawn by the hygienists; therapy was a painfully inefficient use of a psychiatrist's time. The lesson driven home was that prevention was the best approach to the problem of

mental illness. The psychiatrists' well-publicized "cures" of shell-shock created the atmosphere in which the mental hygiene movement subsequently thrived.(10)

Salmon's ambition had always been to steer the NCMH into a mission of mental hygiene maximally conceived. On leave during the War, he resumed his post as Medical Director in 1920 and devoted his efforts to promoting the NCMH. Before he resigned in 1922, Salmon planned the momentous Commonwealth Fund "Program for the Prevention of Delinquency" which launched the child guidance movement and greatly stimulated the visiting teacher movement, the development of psychiatric social work, and the penetration of mental hygiene into the public schools.(11) In the meantime, first under Salmon and then under his successor, Dr. Frankwood E. Williams, the mental hygiene movement made even more rapid progress in the college and universities.

III

The pioneer college mental hygiene service was started in 1910 at Princeton by Dr. Stewart Paton, an influential psychiatrist and one of the founding fathers of the mental hygiene movement. As a lecturer in neurobiology, Paton informally opened his office as a mental hygiene clinic to help students with problems of adjustment.(12) Although his "conferences" were popular with students, at first he was unable to convince his psychiatrist colleagues that there was a field for useful work on the nation's campuses. By

1915 Paton had won over a small group of fellow psychiatrists and NCMH activists including Salmon, Williams, Campbell, and Arthur H. Ruggles; but the war intervened before they or the NCMH could pursue the matter. The real drive for college mental hygiene began in earnest after the War when a connection with the colleges and universities became a high priority of the NCMH.

The psychiatrists' experience in treating war neuroses had proved that timely psychiatric intervention even with adults might prevent serious mental illness. But prosaic concerns of self-interest were also involved with the pressure to establish mental hygiene in the colleges and universities. The status of the profession of psychiatry was still marginal in the early twenties; psychiatry as a distinct scientific specialty was not yet even completely accepted in schools of medicine.(13) Psychiatrists were anxious to enhance their stature in the academic community. Furthermore, the NCMH and the mental hygiene movement had so far developed without institutional backing. The prestige of a university or college connection would help legitimate both psychiatry and mental hygiene in a way that a connection with the penal system and industry or the foundations could not. In addition, to reach college youth was necessary if mental hygiene and psychiatry were to gain widespread public acceptance, which was another goal of the mental hygiene movement.(14) Finally, and perhaps most important, many psychiatrists came out of their war service determined to avoid the problems of the insane, the mentally deficient, and the alcoholic, which had been their preoccupation before

the war. They preferred to deal with "functional disorders," that is, general problems of personality.(15) They were joined by younger psychiatrists who came of age during the war years and were equally disinclined to pursue their profession in hospitals or asylums or with veterans suffering from neurosis. They preferred the new child guidance clinics, private practice, or, when feasible, practice at a college or university.(16)

In the early 1920s, mental hygiene services were established at a handful of colleges almost simultaneously by a cadre of psychiatrists influenced or recruited by Paton, or Salmon and the NCMH. The pioneers were Drs. Harry Kerns at West Point, Karl Menninger at Washburn College, Arthur Ruggles at Dartmouth, Angus Morrison at the University of Minnesota, Austen Fox Riggs at Vassar, and S. Kinnear Smith and Eva Reid at the University of California. Post-war developments in the colleges and universities provided an opening for them. Ruggles, Riggs, and Menninger, were able to locate in recently established student personnel bureaus.(17) Kerns, Morrison, Smith, Reid, and Paton became attached to the student health services.(18) In 1925, Ruggles, who had left Dartmouth in 1923 to become Superintendent of Butler Hospital in Providence, Rhode Island, was persuaded to take a leave of absence for a year to inaugurate a mental hygiene service at Yale's Department of University Health.(19) One year later, Yale took over center stage in the mental hygiene movement in higher education.

The NCMH had been active in securing psychiatrists to lecture or practice at the colleges and

universities. It published a journal, MENTAL HYGIENE and an informal monthly BULLETIN by means of which the hygienists could keep in regular contact with each other. Nevertheless, after an initial flurry of enthusiasm, interest in student mental hygiene seemed to be waning. One obstacle to continued progress was confusion about administratively where the hygienist should be located. Should he or she be in the department of student health, the department of psychology, the personnel bureau, the hospital or medical school? This issue was a thorny one, bedevilling the NCMH throughout the 1920s. If integrating mental hygiene into campus life were the goal, it seemed logical that the hygienists should be attached to a student personnel bureau. But personnel bureaus were largely dominated by psychologists, whom most psychiatrists viewed with antipathy and distrust, as narrowly trained practitioners who focused on a minor part of the psyche (intelligence) and who ignored the most important part (personality). Also, they were increasingly becoming professional rivals in therapy.(20) Most psychiatrists wished to avoid as far as possible any association with psychologists, a factor which eliminated departments of psychology as well as personnel bureaus. Most psychiatrists desired as close an association with medicine as possible, identifying mental hygiene as a medical specialty. Logically, this meant affiliation with the medical school or hospital. But these were isolated from campus life. That left the physician-dominated student health service as the preferred location. This was the official NCMH position. Nevertheless, a few psychiatrists advocated the personnel bureau, while many college and university administrators did not

understand that there was a controversy about location, so long as the job got done. A model service might settle the matter.

Williams of the NCMH had for years been urging the Commonwealth Fund to extend its interest in promoting mental hygiene in the schools to include higher education. In 1925 he succeeded.(21) Williams next turned to Yale, a bastion of the mental hygiene movement since 1909 and the birth of the NCMH. Beers, the NCMH founder, was an alumnus of Yale. And from the beginning, the NCMH enjoyed the support of the "Yale Group," including Arthur Twining Hadley, Yale's president. In 1921, the NCMH gained an invaluable addition to the group when James R. Angell, a distinguished psychologist, became President of Yale, succeeding Hadley. Angell, a long-time member of the NCMH, was elected NCMH vice-president in 1924 and subsequently became active in its affairs. Angell had personally intervened to get Ruggles to come to Yale to inaugurate the mental hygiene service there. He secured a small subvention from the General Education Board, $15,000 a year for five years, to help establish a department of psychiatry in the Yale School of Medicine.(22) Williams brought Angell, Beers, and Barry Smith of the Commonwealth Fund together to discuss the possibility of a Fund subsidized project in mental hygiene at Yale. When the Commonwealth Fund agreed to support generously the proposed department of psychiatry and to strict medical supervision of the mental hygiene project, Williams was able to secure the cooperation of Dean Milton C. Winternitz on behalf of the conservative Yale School of Medicine.(23)

In the fall of 1926 a $250,000, five-year demonstration in mental hygiene and psychiatry was launched at Yale, the largest of its kind ever attempted in an American college or university. The project involved the establishment of a new Division of Student Hygiene in a new Department of Mental Hygiene and Psychiatry, fully integrated into the School of Medicine but housed in and associated with Department of University Health. Incorporating the "team" concept in mental hygiene exemplified in the Fund's child guidance clinics, the project included provisions for one psychologist, two psychiatric social workers, and four psychiatrists. The team was to be headed by Paton who was now retired from Princeton.(24) The aim of the project was to lay the permanent foundations of a mental hygiene service for students at Yale, to establish a department of psychiatry in the School of Medicine at Yale, and to stimulate the development of mental hygiene at other colleges and universities.

With Yale, "the guide and mentor for scores of inland colleges" finally in their camp, hygienists looked forward confidently to rapid expansion. By 1930 there were about twenty colleges and universities employing the services of a psychiatrist full- or part-time or on a consulting basis for mental hygiene work with students. Though relatively small in number, these institutions were both influential and geographically diverse, including by 1930, not only the institutions already cited--but Harvard, Smith, Brown, Wellesley, Mt. Holyoke, the University of Vermont, the University of Colorado, Northwestern University, the University of Michigan, and the University of Chicago.(25)

IV

"As a general rule," sociologist Robert C. Angell once observed, "undergraduate life is pleasurable, even at times gay."(26) Not according to the hygienists. To the hygienists, carefree college days were a myth. For too many youth, college meant difficulty and suffering. Colleges and universities were crowded with "casualties," victims or potential victims of mental illness with more students suffering from personality disorders than was realized. Not even "geniuses" or students of high academic standing were immune.(27) In the early twenties the hygientists conducted questionnaire surveys of students to demonstrate the need for mental hygiene.(28) Dr. Vivian V. Anderson, NCMH Associate Medical Director, concluded that 10-15% of college students badly needed psychiatric help.(29) Shortly thereafter, however, the hygienists began to take a different line, that mental illness or full-fledged neurosis was not the real concern of college mental hygienists. Their concern should be with minor personality disorders, the problems of adjustment which occur in otherwise healthy youth in the period of "late adolescence."

That the hygienists made the "need of adolescence" one of their key theoretical justifications for college and university mental hygiene constitutes an interesting development. The hygienists required a theory to help explain or justify their activities on the campus, because reference to students as

"casualities" had limited utility. Hygienists found what they required in the idea of "adolescence." It provided them with a concept of the college years as a special or distinctive stage of development which required special medical expertise for those who would guide it. Furthermore, it enhanced their claim of usefulness to college and university administrators concerned with the problems of youth in "late adolescence" and enhanced their jurisdictional claim of expertise vis-a-vis the psychologists.

Adolescence as a special phase of the life cycle was confirmed by G. Stanley Hall at the turn of the century in his monumental, ADOLESCENCE.(30) But by the early twenties, Hall's ideas and Hall himself had fallen into neglect. The hygienists revived Hall's view of adolescence as a formative period and of the college years as the period of late adolescence.(31) Hygienists depicted the college years as more important for mental hygiene than those of childhood. Youth were more impressionable than children, because they were away from home and the supervision of parents. Echoing Hall, they stressed that college years were a period of grave danger. Students entering college faced "all the common problems of adolescent growth and social adjustment. . . feelings of inferiority, feelings of guilt, unhealthy attachments to members of the family, many confusions over matters of sex, unhealthy attitudes toward questions of authority, fears of various sorts."(32) The inevitable problems of adolescence were exacerbated by stresses and strains unique to the college experience: loneliness, adapting to new-found freedom, coping with unsettling ideas, meeting the colleges academic standards, adjusting to

college society.

Without help, many students foundered. Their difficulties surfaced in symptoms of all sorts: physical complaints, social maladjustment, mood swings, behavior or discipline problems, and scholastic problems as well as serious mental illness.(33) The college hygienists took all student complaints seriously; every complaint was a "problem". Psychiatrists, as Williams wrote, had learned through hard experience not to belittle minor or "absurdly simple" cases which if neglected might turn into serious ones.(34) Another reason hygienists took all complaints seriously was that the hygienists' model of normal personality and mental health was perfectionist, one of perfect "happiness" and perfect "efficiency," with all deviations viewed as symptomatic.(35)

The hygienists' goal of prevention of mental illness finally dictated that they reach all students. This could not be achieved by waiting for students to show up at the mental hygiene service. Dr. Milton Harrington, Ruggles' successor at Dartmouth, urged that students be divided into small sections with a junior faculty member assigned as a counselor to each section. The faculty counselor was to follow each student in his section through the four years of college and to be responsible to the "mental hygiene officer," the psychiatrist.(36) However, most hygienists favored more practical methods. A popular technique was the informal, small group discussion. For example, during the winter of 1926-27, psychiatrists on Yale's mental hygiene staff held "smokers" with small groups of freshman every night of the week. Informal discussions

were held before the open fire. Questions were encouraged. The psychiatrists made themselves available for consultation afterwards. However, only a relative handful of students could be reached this way. The most efficient way to reach students was through courses in mental hygiene.

As early as 1922, Menninger was offering a course in mental hygiene at Washburn. Dartmouth, Vassar, Brown, the University of Minnesota, and George Washington University followed within a few years. In 1927, Yale introduced a course in mental hygiene as an elective for sophomores and upper classmen. Some hygienists favored courses which resembled the conventional academic fare based upon principles of normal psychology, principles of abnormal psychology, principles of mental hygiene and taught with the aid of books, lectures, and recitations. Other hygienists lectured informally on the emotional and social problems confronting students: "mental mechanisms", the "instinctual life," healthy and unhealthy modes of adjusting to life, and the new understanding of mental illness. The hygienists who taught courses in mental hygiene invaribly required an end-of-term autobiography or "psychiatric life history" of students which they supplemented with a personal interview.(37) Most hygienists provided information, advice, or an assemblage of maxims.(38) A few like Dartmouth's Harrington encouraged discussion of intimate personal concerns. It was impossible for him to give "any clear or precise idea of what I teach." Dr. E. Van Norman Emery, a member of the Yale mental hygiene team in the early thirties, conceived of the course in mental hygiene as transformational, a "molding force," a

re-creation of the personality.(39) Probably all hygienists agreed with Clements Fry that their main task was sex education.(40)

Successful pursuit of the goal of prevention required not only that the hygienists influence students' personality development directly through individual treatment or courses in mental hygiene but indirectly through reform of certain administrative practices. Hygienists were convinced that personality buckled under stress. This conviction led the hygienists to intervene in the problem of academic failure as well as the problem of discipline. The hygienists sought through campus-wide lectures, personal contacts, informal meetings with small groups of administrators and faculty and their wives to give presidents, deans, personnel officers, and faculty "the mental hygiene point of view" toward student problems. According to hygienists any student disciplinary or academic problem should be viewed as a "symptom." The important thing was to search for causes. Emotional difficulties were usually at the root of student problems, and such difficulties were frequently beyond conscious control. A student with a "problem" should be treated as sick or maladjusted, in need of treatment rather than punishment.(41) In addition, the mental hygiene point of view blamed parents for the problems of students.(42)

The mental hygiene point of view toward academic and discipline problems was part of a more comprehensive approach to higher education. In hygienist writings on the broad subject of higher education three themes were salient: one, a scorn for

intellectualism in general; two, a more specific critique of intellectualism in higher education; and, three, a demand that the university or college become an institution for personality development.(43) The hygienists' underlying assumption was that colleges should prepare for life and that the human being was ruled by emotions not intellect. By their emphasis on intellect and their neglect of the emotions, the colleges and universities were not preparing students for life. There were "battalions" of college graduates of sound physique an high IQ, asserted Williams, who were handicapped emotionally and burdened with unhealthy personality traits like introversion, over-conscientiousness, over-sensitiveness, and excessive ratiocination, which contributed to the world's supply of "college-graduate failures and mediocrities."(44)

The colleges and universities crammed students' minds with information but failed to provide students with self-knowledge. Thus, the colleges and universities did not provide "the essentials of an education," to use a phrase from one of Paton's articles much quoted in the twenties.(45) The "essentials of an education" comprised the new knowledge of human nature and personality development granted by psychiatry: knowledge of the "real driving forces" of human behavior, the "instinctive life," the "deep emotional undercurrents shaping the personality." The Socratic injunction "Know Thyself" was at last to be fulfilled, not through the arts and sciences, philosophy and history but through psychiatry and mental hygiene.

V

With the resignation of Williams as NCMH Medical Director in 1930 and the onset of the Depression, the hygienists' drive to gain a foothold in the colleges and universities slackened. Then, under the leadership of Yale's Clement C. Fry the movement picked up momentum again. Interest in college and university mental hygiene peaked in the pre-World War II period at the National Conference on College Hygiene held in Washington, D.C., in the winter of 1936.(46) By then, the NCMH could look back on some substantial accomplishments. A survey of more than 865 collegiate institutions gave impressive evidence of the development of a mental hygiene consciousness on the country's campuses. Of the 479 institutions which responded, 45% indicated interest in establishing a mental hygiene service, 93.5% thought attention to mental hygiene important for college students, and 41% were actually offering some "formal" mental hygiene work.(47) At most of the colleges and universities, the mental hygiene work was undertaken by psychologists or other "personnel" specialists, but at 43 institutions it was the responsibility of a psychiatrist who, because of the depression, was an expensive luxury. Another hygienist survey in 1939-40 showed 75 major colleges and universities offering courses in mental hygiene, approximately three times as many as in 1930.(48)

There is an irony in these surveys detailing progress in mental hygiene. As late as 1936, college

and university psychiatrists were taking a hard line toward psychology. Although the hygienists may have wished to disseminate mental hygiene as widely as possible, they also wished to keep mental hygiene the exclusive preserve of medicine and psychiatry. In this they failed. It was never their intention to enhance the prestige or increase the number of psychological counselors or other non-medical mental health professionals. But, having taken as their province the everyday problems of life, the psychiatrists' efforts to claim exclusive rights to mental hygiene was not defensible.(49) By 1940, most of the mental hygiene work on the campuses was being performed by psychologists. On the other hand, by then the mental hygiene point of view had deeply penetrated psychological counseling. In the military terminology so dear to them, the hygienists lost the battle but won the war.

The real influence of the mental hygiene movement in higher education, however, cannot be stated quantitatively. Its goal was to alter attitudes, to influence life so that in Meyer's words "what is medicine to-day will become mere common sense tommorrow or at least with the next generation."(50) In this, the mental hygiene movement also enjoyed some success, as can be documented in the area of student discipline where the hygienists did not have to wait a generation to make their ideas accepted as common sense. By the mid-twenties the mental hygiene point of view toward discipline was in the ascendancy. When students who broke rules were once found guilty, in some progressive colleges and universities they were now diagnosed as emotionally disturbed and referred to the psychiatrist

for treatment. Thanks to the mental hygiene movement, Vassar's President Henry MacCracken observed that he now had a better understanding of why students got into trouble. In the old days students caught stealing, lying, or cheating were accused of "badness, naughtiness, moral depravity," and "disregarding the high ideals of the college." "We expelled those students," he continued, "more or less publicly. We have brought a stain upon their honor and grief to their family. Now, we retain them and cooperate with the psychiatrist to bring them back again to normality."(51) By the mid-1930s, the mental hygiene point of view dominated student counseling at the University of Minnesota, the country's acknowledged leader in that field. Students in trouble were dealt with as "problems of maladjustment;" the "harsh certitudes of arbitrary authority have given way to a program of adjustment guided by scientific principle."(52) Dean Edmund G. Williamson called it "The Minnesota Point of View." Mental hygiene had become "common sense" at the University of Minnesota. Such attitudes are widespread today, and go beyond the campus. As stated earlier, developments in the history of higher education intersect with current analyses of the penetration of psychiatric concepts into all aspects of American life and thought in this century.

Current revisionist historical interpretations of progressivism and reform movements in general, like those of David Rothman, view "doing good" as a mask for elitism, manipulation, and social control. Critics of psychiatry and the mental health professions, such as Foucault, Goffman, Szasz, Lasch and others, argue that psychiatry can be best understood if approached not as

an autonomous scientific discipline but as political ideaology o: moral tactic. This study provides some evidence on behalf of those with a skeptical view of psychiatry and mental hygiene. The psychiatrists were indeed concerned with "social control." Psychiatry is inevitably concerned with "social control." The hygienists, however, were opposed to the coercion of laws, prohibitive regulations, or violence. They were committed to "personal control," the psychological counterpart to social control and the outcome of personality development.(53) But the hygienist agenda for higher education went beyond a concern for wholesome personality development to incorporate a guide for living, an orientation to life. The campus psychiatrists aspired to be tutors of youth, guides to a new way of life summed up in the phrase, "the mental hygiene point of view,"(54) A brief reminder of the historical context is relevant here.

The 1920s were a time of serious division in American life, rejection of old moralities, and a ferocious "assault on Victorianism," to use Coben's phrase.(55) The twenties were a time of profound disillusionment with America's political leadership, a legacy of the Wilsonian Era, and loss of confidence in democracy, a legacy of the intelligence test movement.(56) In the immediate post-War years, many hygienists were convinced that the fate of America, of democracy, of civilization itself rested in the hands of youth at college. Hygienists invariably referred to college youth as a select group, an intellectual elite, the "best men." College youth were in the "impressionable years." How would they turn out? Would they provide the "wise, sane, constructive

leadership" the nation so urgently required? Would they turn out to be "safe" and "dependable" if only their intellect were developed and not their emotions?(57) How could one ensure that their talents and energies would be directed toward responsible values and behavior? The hygienists stepped forward as the guides and mentors of the country's future leaders. If the colleges and universities would not provide youth with the "essentials of an education," or until they did, the psychiatrists would have to do it. The hygienists were convinced that mental hygiene provided the cure-all for every ill in the world, the key to war and peace, and even to the preservation of democracy itself. It was a quintessentially conservative approach to social change, yet had utopian appeal. There was no need to engage in political struggle or change the structure of society in order to bring a new world into being. Only human psychology had to be changed. Now it was scientifically feasible. The colleges and universities were the strategic agencies. "I switched from psychiatry to education," Paton said, "as it seemed to me that unless students were educated in humane ways there would be no way of checking the spread of emotional and mental disturbances that are the greatest existing menace to peace and to democracy."(58) Convictions like these help explain why many psychiatrists devoted so much time and energy to the psychological well-being of a very small sector of society.

To define the role of the college and university in terms of personality development was also a matter of professionalization; it was in the interests of the professionalization of psychiatry. Karl Menninger

recalls that when he started out in private practice in 1919 he had to go out and look for patients. Washburn College was one of the places he looked. Fifty years later, he commented that psychiatrists were very, very busy.(59) Part of the reason was that psychiatrists successfully promoted themselves and their services. College students, their spouses and children, were the hygienists' future clients. However, to stress only professional self-interest or social control would be unfair to the hygienists, since the campaign to make provision of psychiatric or mental hygiene services an integral part of the university and college also had humanitarian motives. Mental disorder seemed to be ubiquitous, taking a terrible toll in individual misery and social problems. Vulnerable adolescents in college and university might be fortified or immunized against mental illness. The provision of mental hygiene services seemed imperative as a response to the bewildering problems faced by adolescents: the pressure of the "peer society," academic pressure, the new sexual permissiveness, and the students' alienation from religion which in former times might have provided solace and their isolation from the faculty who in an earlier age might have provided support and guidance.(60) The hygienists took it upon themselves to fill the void.

The hygienists occupy a singular niche in the history of higher education. Beginning in about 1890 and culminating around World War I, the university ideal of research and specialization first challenged and then began to dominate the collegiate ideal in American higher education. The early 1920s witnessed the beginning of a rebellion against the university

idea, a "counter-revolution."(61) The hygienists along with the better-known New Humanists, were part of the "resistance." The New Humanists were concerned with the development of the individual, of the "whole person." The New Humanists called upon the colleges to return to the classics and to cultivate the intellectual virtues. By way of contrast, the hygienists repudiated the one-sided emphasis on intellect and depreciated the classics, the humanities, the liberal arts as irrelevant for "real life." What life demanded was not mathematics, Greek, and chemistry but a healthy personality. The hygienists put forward an alternative, therapeutic concept of higher education: the colleges and universities not as sanctuaries of scholarship but as makers of personality.

Most faculty in the twenties and thirties thought that responsibility of the colleges for student personality development should be minimal. Faculty were unsympathetic if not antagonistic to mental hygiene. Their concern was with intellect, not personality. Faculty found the mental hygiene point of view subversive of their values; the hygienists anathemitized the faculty.(62) A 1928 survey of mental hygiene in higher education found that nearly all the colleges hygienists named the faculty as "the greatest hindrance to the success of the mental hygiene program."(63) At Yale, the hygienists had to fight the general feeling among faculty that hygienists were coddling students and that student problems were simply the growing pains of youth. Will power, perserverance, and "intestinal fortitude" were adequate tools for handling any problems, according to the faculty. Those

students who could not shape up were "weak and immature and should not survive" in college.(64)

The hygienists were extremely sensitive to accusations of coddling, of fostering in students a sense of continuing dependence, of perpetuating an out-moded in loco parentis educational philosophy. The hygienists protested that they had no wish to turn the college or university into "an intellectual nursery" or "a haven from the more strenous life."(65) This would be harmful, they said, and directly opposed to the requirements of mental hygiene. However, the hygienists argued, colleges and universities could not escape responsibility for the personality development of their students. The young men and women were there not solely as "minds" but as "whole persons." Students were in late adolescence; few could escape the strains and uncertainties of adolescence. Their personality development had to be a concern of the college. Some college administrators such as Presidents McCracken of Vassar, Angell of Yale, and Lotus Coffman of the University of Minnesota agreed with the hygienists. The colleges and universities could not ignore personality. Where the emotions were concerned, students could not be allowed to sink or swim. Emotional immaturity was a personal disaster and a social waste. Personality development might even help students better achieve academic goals.(66)

The stage was thus set in the twenties and thirties for a fuller discussion of the affective outcomes of education and the responsibility of colleges and universities in the area of personality development beyond the provision of mental hygiene

services. However, between hygienists and faculty there was never much communication; a debate between them never took place. Still, the idea that colleges and universities are institutions whose primary obligation is the personality development of students remains a potent one, continually being rediscovered, but with little accretion of historical awareness.(67)

Footnotes

1. This is a revised an enlarged version of a paper prepared for the Center for Studies In Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, February 19, 1981. I am indebted to Sheldon Rothblatt, Nathan G. Hale, Jr., Michael McGuire, Charles Healy, Ray Hiner, and Claude Goldenberg for their comments.

2. For example, Norman Dain, CLIFFORD W. BEERS, ADVOCATE FOR THE INSANE (Pittsburgh, Pa., University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980); Roy Lubove, THE PROFESSIONAL ALTRUIST: THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIAL WORK AS A CAREER, 1880-1930 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965), Chap. 3; David J. Rothman, CONSCIENCE AND CONVENIENCE: THE ASYLUM AND ITS ALTERNATIVES IN PROGRESSIVE AMERICA (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), Part IV; John C. Burnham, "The New Psychology: From Narcissism to Social Control," in John Braeman et.al., CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICA: THE 1920s (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1968), pp. 394-398.

3. Nevitt Sanford, ed., THE AMERICAN COLLEGE; A PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL INTERPRETATION OF HIGHER LEARNING (New York: Wiley, 1962.)

4. Philip Rieff, THE TRIUMPH OF THE THERAPEUTIC: USES OF FAITH AFTER FREUD (New York: Harper and Row, 1966); Christopher Lasch, THE CULTURE OF NARCISSISM: AMERICAN LIFE IN AN AGE OF DIMINSHING EXPECTATIONS (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978), passim; and Fred Matthews, "In Defense of Common Sense: Mental Hygiene as Ideology and Mentality in Twentieth Century America," PROSPECTS, II (1979): 459-516.

5. For the beginnings and early years of the mental

hygiene movement see Dain, op. cit., and especially Barbara Sicherman, THE QUEST FOR MENTAL HEALTH IN AMERICA, 1880-1917, (Ann Arbor, Mich: University Microfilms International, 1971).

6. Adolf Meyer, "Modern Conceptions of Mental Disease" in Herbert S. Jennings, ed., SUGGESTIONS OF MODERN SCIENCE CONCERNING EDUCATION, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1917); C. Macfie Campbell, A PRESENT-DAY CONCEPTION OF MENTAL DISORDERS (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1924) as well as his DESTINY AND DISEASE IN MENTAL DISORDERS (London: Chapman, 1935). See, also, William Alanson White TWENTIETH CENTURY PSYCHIATRY (New York: Norton, 1936) and his MEDICAL PSYCHOLOGY: THE MENTAL FACTOR IN DISEASE, (New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, 1931).

7. Three popular summaries of mental hygiene are George K. Pratt, YOUR MIND AND YOU: MENTAL HEALTH (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1924); Ernest R. Groves and Phyllis Blanchard, INTRODUCTION TO MENTAL HYGIENE (New York: Henry Holt, 1930); and William Burnham, THE NORMAL MIND (New York: D. Appleton, 1924).

8. Salmon is quoted in Sicherman, op. cit., p. 280.

9. Thomas W. Salmon, "War Neuroses and Their Lesson," NEW YORK MEDICAL JOURNAL, CIX (1919): 933-36; "Notes and Comments," MENTAL HYGIENE, II (1918): 480-81; Groves and Blanchard, op. cit., pp. 40-43.

10. Dain, op. cit., chaps. 13-15.

11. Sol Cohen, "The Mental Hygiene Movement, The Commonwealth Fund, and Public Education, 1921-1933," in Gerald Benjamin, ed., PRIVATE PHILANTHROPHY AND PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION: PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ROCKEFELLER ARCHIVE CENTER CONFERENCE HELD ON JUNE 8, 1979), (The Center: New York, 1980), pp. 33-46.

12. Clarence B. Farrar, "I Remember Stewart Paton," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, CXVII (1960): 161-62; Adolf Meyer, "Stewart Paton, M.D.," JOURNAL OF NERVOUS AND MENTAL DISEASE, XCV (1942): 518-520.

13. William C. Menninger, PSYCHIATRY IN A TROUBLED WORLD, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948), pp. 5-6, 340-41.

14. Clarence M. Hincks, "Public Education and Mental Hygiene," in Frankwood E. Williams, ed., PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON MENTAL HYGIENE, (New York: International Committee for Mental Hygiene, Inc., 1932), I, p. 577.

15. As Salmon stated it, the psychiatrist preferred to treat "minor and relatively insignificant departures from health, where there is opportunity for prevention and early treatment." Quoted in F. L. Wells, "The Status of 'Clinical' Psychology," MENTAL HYGIENE, VI (1922).

16. According to Adolf Meyer, psychiatrists' interest in student mental hygiene was partly an extension of work with veterans into a "a more promising and more normal field." "The Organization of Community Facilities for Prevention, Care, and Treatment of Nervous and Mental Diseases," Williams, ed., PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON MENTAL HYGIENE, I. p. 247.

17. For Dartmouth, see Arthur H. Ruggles, "College Mental Hygiene Problems," MENTAL HYGIENE, IX (1925): 263. For Vassar, see Henry N. MacCracken, "Mental Hygiene in The College Curriculum," Ibid., pp. 473-77 and Austen Fox

Riggs and William B. Terhune, "The Mental Hygiene of College Women," Ibid. XII (1928): 559-62.

18. For West Point, see Harry N. Kerns, "Cadet Problems," MENTAL HYGIENE, VII (1923): 688-96. For the University of Minnesota, see Angus W. Morrison and Harold S. Diehl, "Some Studies In Mental Hygiene Needs of Freshman University Students," JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, LXXXIII, (1924): 1666-72; for the University of California, see Sydney K. Smith, "Psychiatry And University Men," MENTAL HYGIENE, XII (1928): 38-47.

19. "Notes," MENTAL HYGIENE BULLETIN, III, (October 1925): 1, 3.

20. William Healy, "Psychiatry, Psychology, Psychiatrists, Psychologists," MENTAL HYGIENE, VI (1922): 248-56; Thomas V. Moore "A Century of Psychology in Relation to American Psychiatry," in ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF AMERICAN PSYCHIATRY (New York: Columbia University Press, 1950), pp. 472-74; and Wells, op. cit., pp. 11-12. The quarrel goes back to the World War I years. See "Psychiatrist vs. Psychologist," NEW YORK MEDICAL JOURNAL, CV (May 12, 1917): 910-11. See also Thomas M. Canfield," "The Professionalization of American Psychology, 1870-1917," JOURNAL OF THE HISTORY OF THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES, IX (Jan. 1973): 66-76.

21. Based on unpublished material in "Yale University-Department of Mental Hygiene," File 701, in the Commonwealth Fund Archives, The Commonwealth Fund, New York City.

22. "Psychiatry at Yale," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY, V (1925): 323-5; George Wilson Pierson, YALE: COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY, 1921-1937 (New Haven: Yale University Press,

1955), pp. 516-17.

23. Frankwood E. Williams to James R. Angell, June 12, 1925 in "Yale University - Department of Mental Hygiene," File 701. Commonwealth Fund Archives.

24. Clements C. Fry and Edna Rostow, MENTAL HYGIENE IN COLLEGE (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1942), pp. XII-XIII. This is a balanced account of the project by two of the participants.

25. Winifred Richmond, "Mental Hygiene in The College," JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, XCIII (Dec. 21, 1929): 1937.

26. THE CAMPUS: A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY UNDERGRADUATE LIFE IN THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY. (New York: D. Appleton, 1928), p. 6.

27. Anon., "Mental Hygiene And the College Student Twenty Years After," MENTAL HYGIENE, V (1921): 736-40; Earl D. Bond, "To A Graduating Class of Geniuses," Ibid. XIII (1929): 520-28.

28. Stanley Cobb, "A Report on A Brief Neuropsychiatric Examination of 1,141 Students," JOURNAL OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE, III (1922): 309-15; Morrison and Diehl, "Some Studies On Mental Hygiene Needs of Freshman University Students," op. cit., pp. 1668-9; Smiley Blanton, "A Mental Hygiene Program for Colleges," MENTAL HYGIENE, IX (1925): 479.

29. Anderson, "Psychiatry in College," op. cit., p. 372.

30. ADOLESCENCE: ITS PSYCHOLOGY (New York: Appleton, 1905), I, pp. XIII, XV, XVIII. See also, Joseph Kett, RITES OF PASSAGE: ADOLESCENCE IN AMERICA, 1970 TO THE PRESENT, (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 217-21; and Dorothy Ross, G. STANLEY HALL: THE PSYCHOLOGIST

AS PROPHET, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. 316, 323.

31. C. Macfie Campbell "The Responsibilities of the University in Promoting Mental Hygiene", MENTAL HYGIENE, III (1919): 205; Arthur H. Ruggles, "College Mental Hygiene Problems," Ibid., IX (1925): 262.

32. Fry and Rostow, op. cit., pp. 6-9, 14-15, 32-33; Frankwood E. Williams, "Mental Hygiene and the College Student," MENTAL HYGIENE, IX (1925): 225-7; Sidney L. Pressey, "The College and Adolscent Needs," in Sidney L. Pressey, ed., RESEARCH ADVENTURES IN UNIVERSITY TEACHING, (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Company, 1927), pp. 81-5. Winifred Richmond, THE ADOLESCENT BOY (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1933), pp. 213 ff.

33. Austen Fox Riggs and William B. Terhune, "The Mental Hygiene of College Women," MENTAL HYGIENE, XII (1928): 561-65. Karl Menninger, THE HUMAN KIND (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930), pp. 406-7, and "Adaption Difficulties In College Students;" MENTAL HYGIENE, XI (1927): 519-23.

34. Williams, "Mental Hygiene And The College Student," op. cit., p. 222.

35. Ibid, p. 282; Arthur H. Ruggles, "The College Student and Mental Hygiene," PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION, VII (1930): 282, 284-5.

36. Milton A. Harrington, "A College Mental Hygiene Department," THE SURVEY, LIX (Jan. 15, 1928): 510-12; Vivian V. Anderson, PSYCHIATRY IN EDUCATION (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932), p. 37.

37. E. g., Blanton, "A Mental Hygiene Program for Colleges," op. cit., p. 484; Harry A. Steckel,

"Outline of A Comprehensive Course in Mental Hygiene," PSYCHIATRIC QUARTERLY, II (1928): 342-344; MENNINGER, op. cit., p. 432.

38. Menninger, for example, provides a five-point guide to mental hygiene: set up as an ideal the facing of reality; cultivate social contacts and social ideals; recognize neurotic evasions and take opportunities for sublimation; learn to recognize the evidence of mental pathology in others; and "assume that the unhappy are always wrong." THE HUMAN MIND, p. 407.

39. "The Content And Method of Instructing College Students In Mental Hygiene," MENTAL HYGIENE, XVII (Oct. 1933): 596-7.

40. Fry and Rostow, op. cit., p. 160.

41. Smith, "Psychiatry And University Men," op. cit., p. 44; Frankwood E. Williams, "Mental Hygiene And the College Student," "MENTAL HYGIENE, IX (1925): 245; Kimball Young, "Mental Hygiene and Personality Guidance in College," Ibid., p. 490; Menninger, THE HUMAN MIND, pp. 425-428.

42. Frankwood E. Williams, "Finding A Way In Mental Hygiene," MENTAL HYGIENE, XIV (1930): 225-237. See also Ruggles, "College Mental Hygiene Problems," op. cit., p. 81. Vassar's Dean Thompson rapidly assimilated the mental hygiene point of view. Where student problems were concerned, she explains, "two-to-one, a neurotic mother or despotic father is at the root of difficulty." C. Mildred Thompson, "The Value of Mental Hygiene In the College," MENTAL HYGIENE, XI (1927): 235.

43. The writings of Frankwood Williams and Stewart Paton were espcially influential among hygienists. Williams' ADOLESCENCE: STUDIES IN MENTAL HYGIENE, (New York: Farrar and Rinehart,

1930), brings together many of his papers on college mental hygiene. Many of Paton's speeches and articles of the immediate post-war period are collected in two books: EDUCATION IN WAR AND PEACE (New York: P.B. Hoeber, 1921), and SIGNS OF SANITY AND THE PRINCIPLES OF MENTAL HYGIENE (New YOrk: C. Scribner's Sons, 1922).

44. Williams, "Menttal Hygiene And the College Student," MENTAL HYGIENE, V (1921), p. 268; Arthur H. Ruggles, "College Mental Hygiene Problems," MENTAL HYGIENE, IX (1925): 261.

45. "The Essentials of an Education," MENTAL HYGIENE, IV (1920): 268-280.

46. Theophile Raphael, "Mental Hygiene Services For Colleges And Universities," MENTAL HYGIENE, XXI (1937): 559-574.

47. Ibid., pp. 559-60.

48. Harold W. Bernard, "College Mental Hygiene: A Decade of Growth," MENTAL HYGIENE, 22 (1940): 413-17.

49. The dilemma of the psychiatrists is sensitively discussed in John C. Burnham, "The Struggles Between Physicians and Paramedical Personnel in American Psychiatry, 1917-1941," JOURNAL OF THE HISTORY OF MEDICAL AND ALLIED SCIENCES, XXIX (1974): 93-107.

50. "The 'Complaint' as the Center of Genetic--Dynamic and Nosological Teaching In Psychiatry," NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE, CXCIX (1928): 360.

51. "Mental Hygiene In The College Curriculum," MENTAL HYGIENE, IX (1925): 475.

52. James Gray, THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, 1851-1951, (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of

Minnesota, 1951), pp. 359-60. See also HIGHER EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY: A REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), pp. 53-54, 65-66.

53. See the discussion of social control in Morris Janowitz, THE LAST HALF-CENTURY: SOCIAL CHANGE AND POLITICS IN AMERICA, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 29, 243ff.

54. As George K. Pratt, William's successor in 1931 as Medical Director of the NCMH put it, with reference to the psychiatrist in general, "his is a task formerly relegated to the priest or pastor, to teacher and philosopher." Pratt, YOUR MIND AND YOU, pp. 54-55. In an earlier, more religious age, the professors of moral philosophy performed a similar function. See Daniel Walker Howe, THE UNITARIAN CONSCIENCE: HARVARD MORAL PHILOSOPHY, 1805-1861, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970).

55. Stanley Coben, "The Assault on Victorianism in Twentieth Century America," AMERICAN QUARTERLY, XXVII (1975): 604-625.

56. Everywhere, said a widely-read hygienist in 1924, there was "doubt in regard to democracy..., pessimism in regard to civilization, hopelessness in regard to the lack of intelligence in...the people, and hope only in the superior few." Burnham, THE NORMAL MIND, p. 685.

57. Arthur H. Ruggles, MENTAL HYGIENE: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Company, 1934) pp. 103-104; Williams, "Mental Hygiene and the College Student." 229-230.

58. Paton, EDUCATION IN WAR AND PEACE, p. 5; Farrar, op. cit., 162.

59. Lucy Freeman, ed. SPARKS: BY KARL MENNINGER, (New York: Crowell, 1973), pp. XXI, 255.

60. Religion was becoming passe. While, according to Robert Angell, "thousands of students do not know a single professor in any but a formal, professional way." THE CAMPUS, p. 64. The problems of college youth are sensitively portrayed in Paula Fass, THE BEAUTIFUL AND THE DAMNED: AMERICAN YOUTH IN THE TWENTIES (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).

61. Frederick Rudolph, THE AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY: A HISTORY, (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), pp. 449ff. See also Laurence Veysey, "Stability and Change In The American Undergraduate Curriculum," in Carl Kaysen, ed., CONTENT AND CONTEXT: ESSAYS ON COLLEGE EDUCATION, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 7-9.

62. Donald Slesinger, "Professor vs. Psychiatrist," THE SURVEY, LIX (1928): 761-63.

63. Richmond, "Mental Hygiene In the Colleges," 1936.

64. Fry and Rostow, op. cit., p. 4.

65. Fry and Rostow, op. cit., p. 19; Angus Morrison, "A Further Discussion of College Mental Hygiene," MENTAL HYGIENE, XII (1928): 53; Ruggles, "The College Student and Mental Hygiene," p. 281.

66. See Angell's "Mental Hygiene In the College and University," MENTAL HYGIENE BULLETIN, VII (1929): 2, 4-5, 8 and his "Mental Hygiene and Education" in Williams, ed., PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MENTAL HYGIENE, I, 788-793. See also, Pierson, op. cit., pp. 516-17. For Coffman's views see THE

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, 1923-24, pp. 11-12; and Gray, op. cit., pp. 282-285, 360.

67. In the mid-1950s there was a revival of interest in the role of the college and university in personality development. See especially Daniel H. Funkenstein, ed., THE STUDENT AND MENTAL HEALTH: THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STUDENT MENTAL HEALTH, Princeton, N.J., Sept. 5-15, 1956; (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1956); See also Group for Advancement of Psychiatry, "The Role of Psychiatry in Colleges and Universities," Report #17 (1957) and Dana L. Farnsworth, MENTAL HEALTH IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Press, 1957). In the sixties, Nevitt Sanford took the leadership in reviving the issue. See Sanford, ed., THE AMERICAN COLLEGE: A PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL INTERPRETATION OF THE HIGHER LEARNING, as well as his WHERE COLLEGES FAIL: A STUDY OF THE STUDENT AS A PERSON (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967). For the most recent manifestation of this phenomenon, see Clyde A. Parker, Ed., ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENT IN COLLEGE STUDENTS, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978).

Academic Quality Rankings: Why They Developed in the United States and Not Europe

David S. Webster

This article has three purposes. The first is to show a strain of scholarship in Europe during the last third of the nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth century that could well have led to the development of academic quality rankings but did not. The second is to show how academic quality rankings were invented in the United States early in the twentieth century by the eminent Columbia University psychologist James McKeen Cattell from a research interest not very different from that of European scholarship. The third, which is the heart of the article, is to suggest that the reason why academic quality rankings could develop in turn-of-the-century America and flourish immediately thereafter and yet failed to develop in Europe was because of the different natures of European and American universities and their different roles in their respective societies.

Academic quality rankings are efforts to rank order colleges and universities or, much more commonly,

individual departments within them in order of their presumed quality based upon one or more criteria. The more frequently used criteria for rank ordering colleges and universities over the years have included the following: their graduates' achievements in later life based upon their income, occupations, or listings in publications such as WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA; the research accomplishments of their faculty as measured by their academic awards and honors and scholarly reputations among their peers; and their resources as measured, for example, by the number of books and journals in their libraries, the amount and quality of their laboratory equipment, and the size of their instructional budgets.

One important characteristic of an academic quality ranking, as it is defined in this article, is that the person who compiled it intended it as such. If, for example, two people each compile a rank order of universities in order of how many distinguished scientists have attended each institution and one regards his or her list as measuring the quality of these universities while the other regards his or her list as only data about the academic origins of scientists, only the first list will be considered for this analysis.

The studies in Europe which could have led to the development of academic quality rankings were the books, monographs, and articles published in several European countries (including England, France, and Germany) concerned with the lives of eminent men and women: where they were born, where they grew up, where they attended school, and whether and where they studied at a university.(1) Most of those who wrote

about the university origins of eminent people took one side or another on the question of whether such "geniuses," as the subjects in this debate often called them, were more the products of their heredity or their environment.(2) The contributions of those writers who stressed the influence of the environment will be discussed first, followed by those of the writers who stressed the role of heredity. Finally, the contribution will be discussed of a writer who took no side in the heredity-environment debate but who produced in 1900 a work that had the characteristics of an academic quality ranking but was not regarded as such by himself or others.

One of the first to stress the influence of the environment was the Swiss botanist Alphonse de Candolle.(3) In his HISTOIRE DES SCIENCES ET DES SAVANTS DEPUIS DEUX SIECLES, he listed eighteen factors he considered favorable to the advancement of science, including two directly concerning education:

> Elementary, and especially middle and higher instruction, that is well-organized, independent of political or religious factions, tending to inspire research and to encourage young people and instructors devoted to science ..... Abundant and well-organized material means for various kinds of scientific work (libraries, observatories, laboratories, collections).(4)

Another early environmentalist was Alfred Odin (1864-1896), professor at the University of Sofia in Bulgaria. In his short life he wrote several works on

phonology and grammar and a major work in two volumes on the origin or French men of letters, GENESE DES GRANDS HOMMES: GENS DE LETTRES FRANCAIS MODERNES. In it, he wrote:

> Everything...forces us to admit that education plays a role not only important but principal, decisive in the development of the man of letters. It operates not only on average ability, but also, and with quite as much intensity, on talent and on genius.(5)

Those who stressed the influence of heredity on the development of genius were far more numerous than the environmentalists, and they also came closer to producing an academic quality ranking.

The first great hereditarian was Francis Galton, himself a member of a distinguished family; he was related to Charles and Erasmus Darwin. In 1865 he published a two-part paper in MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE titled "Hereditary Talent and Character." In it, after examining lists of eminent people, predominantly men, in several lines of endeavor and finding that many of them had distinguished relatives, even in fields like writing and painting in which Galton believed it was hard for parents to "pass on" their advantages to their children, he concluded that superior intellectual ability resulted mostly from heredity.(6) In 1869 he published HEREDITARY GENIUS, in which he claimed to be the first person ever to use detailed statistical evidence to argue that genius was hereditary. In 1874, in response to Candolle's HISTOIRE DES SCIENCES DES SAVANTS DEPUIS DEUX SIECLES, he published ENGLISH MEN

OF SCIENCE: THEIR NATURE AND NURTURE(7), whose subtitle introduced "one of the most important and controversial distinctions in the social sciences ever since..."(8) Using replies from more than 100 scientists to a long questionnaire, Galton attempted to provide "a natural history of the English men of science to the present day."(9) He concluded the following about their university education:

> One-third of those who sent replies have been educated at Oxford or Cambridge, one-third at Scotch, Irish or London universities, and the remaining third at no university at all. I am totally unable to decide which of the three groups occupies the highest scientific position: they seem to me very much alike in this respect.(10)

Thus by 1874 a "genius" study contained a calculation of the percentage of eminent men who had graduated from particular universities (Oxford, Cambridge, and London) and not just from all universities as a group.

Another hereditarian was Theodule Ribot, Professor of Comparative and Experimental Psychology at the College of France, whose works, in all their editions and translations, totalled nearly 200 listings in the NATIONAL UNION CATALOG, PRE-1956 IMPRINTS.(11) Ribot believed that on people of genius, as opposed to more ordinary people, education had almost no effect:

> Suppose the various degrees of human intelligence to be arranged

> in such a way that they should form one immense linear series extending from idiocy at one extreme to genius at the other. In our opinion, the influence of education at the two ends of the series is at its minimum. Upon the idiot it has almost no effect... It attains its maximum in those average natures who, being neither good nor bad, are about what chance makes them. Then, if we rise toward the higher forms of intelligence we see it again diminish, and as the highest genius is approached, it tends toward its minimum.(12)

Sometimes the hereditarians, instead of comparing those who had graduated from universities with those who had not, compared students from a particular university who had been successful while in school with those who had been much less successful. An example of this type of study is the anonymous 1882 article in CORNHILL MAGAZINE about the Cambridge University senior wranglers. The senior wrangler was the student who, each year, achieved the highest grade in a mathematics honors examination out of a senior class which averaged 400 to 500 students.(13) The author reviewed the careers after university study of senior wranglers from 1748 to his time and concluded:

> ...the most obvious inference....is that very little can be inferred. Universities and schools calmly speak of "producing" great men, when all that can be safely said is that they have not put an end to them.(14)

Another writer who on at least one occasion took a

strong hereditarian position was James Sully, the early British psychologist, author of SENSATION AND INTUITION (1874), THE HUMAN MIND (1892), STUDIES OF CHILDHOOD (1895) and other books, and Grote Professor of Philosophy of Mind and Logic at the University of London's University College. In his well-known OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE THEORY OF EDUCATION (1885), he took the position that heredity and environment were both vital to the intellectual development of ordinary people.(15) But writing about eminent men in the ENGLISH ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE in 1891, he named many who had had academic difficulties and been severe disciplinary problems in school and wrote that:

> The conclusion that seems to be forced on us by the study of the lives of men of letters is that they owe a remarkably small portion of their learning to the established machinery of instruction. A good number have only very imperfectly come under the influence of the educational system, while a large fraction of those who have been more fully subjected to it have been too little in harmony with its spirit and methods to derive from it any large and substantial profit.(16)

Almost 40 years after Galton had spurred the debate about whether nature or nurture "produced" eminent men and women, the hereditarian side of the debate produced an actual list of universities in order of how many eminent people had attended them. Havelock Ellis, the British editor, art and literary critic, and author of the seven-volume STUDIES IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF

SEX, provided such a rank order in his A STUDY OF BRITISH GENIUS (1904) in the following passage:

> Stated somewhat more precisely, it may be said that of our 975 men, 217 were at Oxford (232 if we include those who had also been at some other university); 177 were at Cambridge (191 if we include those who had also been elsewhere); 76 came from Scotch universities (Edinburgh 28, Glasgow 21, St. Andrews 16, Aberdeen 11); from Trinity College, Dublin, have come 27 men; 23 (or 47 if we include those who have previously been at some British university) have been to one or more foreign universities (Paris 23, Leyden 9, Padua 6, Utrecht 3, Louvain 3, Gottingen 2, Bonn 2, Heidelberg 2, etc.).(17)

From this rank order of the universities attended by 975 eminent British men and women it would have been an easy step to draw conclusions about the academic quality of the universites themselves, but Ellis did not make any such inferences.

Ironically enough, despite tne decades-long debate about whether eminent people were the "product" of nature or nurture, what may possibly have been the very first work to list universities in order of how many eminent people they had produced came from the pen of a man who, although he was interested in showing the origins of Britain's "best men," expressed absolutely no opinion about whether distinguished men were the product of nature or nurture. From his book, it is clear that he thought distinguished people were the

result of both hereditary and environment, although he did not say so explicitly and did not attempt to show that one or the other provided the greater influence. He was Alick Henry Herbert Maclean, author of WHERE WE GET OUR BEST MEN (1900).(18) Maclean selected from a variety of sources 3068 men who had lived during the first 60 years of Queen Victoria's reign (1837-1897).

He discussed these men in terms of several characteristics: their nationalities; the counties and towns in which they were born; the number that came from families which had produced, during this period, three or four eminent men; their fathers' occupations; the public schools they had attended, if any; and the university they had attended, if any. He derived from his data a number of generalizations related to ethnic or national background of families, geographic origins, father's occupations, and schools attended. Of the 3068 subjects, 1132 had attended universities in England, Scotland, and Ireland. From this information Maclean produced toward the end of his book the following rank order for these institutions: Oxford, 424; Cambridge, 381; Edinburgh, 132; London, 97; Dublin, 73; Glasgow, 52; Aberdeen, 42; St. Andrews, 18; Belfast College of the University of Ireland, 6; Durham, 3; and Owens College, 2.(19)

Although measuring the quality of these universities by the number of eminent men they had produced was not Maclean's primary concern, he nevertheless was alert, far more so than Havelock Ellis had been, to the potential of these statistics for serving as the basis for inferences about these universities as producers of eminent men. He wrote, for example, that although Edinburgh was the third

largest "producer" of eminent men, "the Edinburgh figures are not high, considering the large numbers of men who have passed through that University." In the same vein, he wrote that London University had been founded so recently "that a fairer idea of the position of 'London' will be obtained by doubling its actual figures." Elsewhere, in a table showing how many eminent men by profession Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, London, and Dublin had produced, he did double London's figures. For the three smallest "producers" on his list, he pointed out that these were "all modern institutions," founded in the 19th century and presumably with small enrollments during the early years of the period covered.

Maclean's table thus came close to being an academic quality ranking. However, Maclean never explicitly discussed his table as a measure of the academic quality of the universities; neither did anyone else. The European debate about whether geniuses resulted more from nature or nurture continued without an academic quality ranking developing from it. However, a decade after Maclean had published WHERE WE GET OUR BEST MEN, the American James McKeen Cattell produced the first academic quality ranking.

Like the Europeans who wrote about the ecological origins of "geniuses," Cattell was interested in the backgrounds of scientists, including the colleges and universities they had attended. At first, he specifically stated that his tables showing the colleges and universities attended by those who later became distinguished American scientists did not reflect the academic quality of these institutions, but gradually he changed his mind.

As early as 1903 he published an article on the academic backgrounds of 200 psychologists.(20) In it, he presented a table showing the number of psychologists who had received the A.B. degree, had undertaken graduate study short of the doctorate, and had received the Ph.D. at various American and European universities in order of how many of the psychologists had attended each institution. Cattell was careful to state, though, that this table was not a measure of these institutions' academic quality in psychology. He commented:

> After the men have graduated from college, and when their work has been chosen, they are gathered for their special studies into a few universities. It does not seem, however, that they are turned into psychologists at these universities. They simply select for study the universities that have reputation and facilities, being often attracted by fellowships or the hope that the university will assist them in securing positions. The direction of the work is sometimes determined or influenced by the university, the merit of the work but slightly, if at all.(21)

In 1906, Cattell published three articles in SCIENCE in which he discussed the college and graduate school attendance of 1000 eminent American scientists in 12 fields.(22) Here he moved a step nearer to treating his data as academic quality rankings, in that he referred to institutions that had trained many

future scientists in one field or another as schools that "excelled" in these fields. He wrote:

> The Johns Hopkins University has excelled relatively in chemistry, physics, zoology, and physiology; Harvard in zoology and botany; Columbia in zoology, botany, and mathematics; Cornell in physics and botany; Clark in psychology, and Michigan in botany and pathology. Of the foreign universites, Berlin has excelled in physics, Leipzig in psychology and Gottingen in chemistry and mathematics.(23)

Though Cattell had thus taken a step closer to regarding his data as a measure of departmental strength in disciplines, he had not quite done so. He displayed a table showing, for the 1000 starred scientists, how many had received their bachelor's degree, done graduate work short of receiving a Ph.D., and received their Ph.D. at various American and foreign universities. Yet, he stopped short of calling this table a list of the best institutions at which to study science, titling it merely "Attendance of the Thousand Men of Science at Different Institutions."(24)

Finally, in 1910 Cattell published two articles in SCIENCE discussing the current academic affiliations, not the collegiate and university origins, of distinguished American scientists.(25) In one of these articles, he presented a table ranking American universities according to a complex weighting scheme measuring how many distinguished scientists they employed, with especially distinguished scientists counting more than less distinguished ones. He titled

this table "The Scientific Strength of the Leading Institutions" (26), making it clear that he now considered the number and ability of the scientists a university employed to be a measure of its scientific quality. This was the first academic quality ranking ever published. Using his system for weighting quality and number, he listed twenty academic institutions and governmental departments, as follows:

INSTITUTION	SCORE
Harvard	146.0
Chicago	94.6
Columbia	79.3
Hopkins	63.4
Yale	61.7
Cornell	57.6
Wisconsin	49.0
Geol. Survey	43.8
Dept. Agric.	40.9
Mass. Inst.	37.7
Michigan	37.1
California	32.4
Carnegie Inst.	30.9
Stanford	30.0
Princeton	28.6
Smithsonian Inst.	26.0
Illinois	25.0
Pennsylvania	24.4
Bureau of Standards	18.9
Clark	16.0

Academic quality rankings, based either on the college and university origins of eminent men and women or on some other criterion or group of criteria, have been a staple of American academic life ever since. Cattell himself published about a dozen more. In the early decades of the twentieth century many other groups and individuals published rankings for American colleges and universities or, more often, for individual disciplines and professional fields within them. By 1925, these included government organizations such as the United States Bureau of Education(27), professional associations such as the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education(28), and individual scholars such as Raymond M. Hughes.(29)

Cattell, during more than three decades (1903-1938), published brief biographies of eminent American scientists in his AMERICAN MEN OF SCIENCE, giving a "star" to the most distinguished. The college and university origins of these "starred" scientists became the basis for numerous other academic quality rankings of American universities.

While studies of the university origins of European "geniuses" did not lead to academic quality rankings, Cattell's work on the collegiate and university origins and current academic affiliations of eminent American scientists led to hundreds of them.

Now it is necessary to explain why several decades of European "genius" studies and other European works on the university origins of eminent people never developed into academic quality rankings, while Cattell's work on the colleges and universities

attended by eminent scientists did. There were many reasons, but they all stem from the differences between European and American institutions of higher learning and their different roles in society.

First, American colleges and universities in the early 20th century existed in a free-enterprise, competitive society, more so than did European universities of the day. The American society placed strong emphasis on being the "best" and the "biggest." American institutions of higher learning probably wanted to excel more than those in Europe. Universities in some European countries, such as France and Germany, were supported by the central government and were thus assured of funding whether or not they excelled. American colleges and universities, on the other hand, most of which at that time were privately supported, needed academic prestige in order to attract students and support. Academic quality rankings were a useful means of recording the winners and losers in such a competition.

It is probably not a coincidence that in early twentieth century America, under the influence of social Darwinism, one finds many early academic quality rankings, such as those of the Council on Medical Education that classified medical schools as A,B,C,D, and so on to indicate purported quality. An interest of most professional associations and accrediting organizationas was to identify schools of low quality to the end of improvement or termination.

Second, in each European nation there were relatively fewer universities, and therefore it was relatively easy for the public to ascertain their

academic quality without recourse to formal quality rankings. In 1895, Odin listed 15 university cities, and thus only that number of universities, in France.(30) In Great Britain at the turn of the twentieth century, there were about a dozen universities.(31) In Germany at the end of the 19th century there were 22, the number listed in the English translation of Fridrich Paulsen's great GERMAN UNIVERSITIES AND UNIVERSITY STUDY.(32) In the United States, on the other hand, there were 647 colleges and (mostly soi-disant) universities by 1901.(33)

Third, in Europe there was not nearly as much range in the quality of institutions of higher learning as there was in the United States, and, therefore, less need to know what the best and worst schools were, because the differences in quality, in any case, would not be very great. The degrees of all German universities, for example, were theoretically equal in prestige. A student of philosophy might decide to attend Heidelberg, a Protestant university, rather than Freiburg, a Catholic one, without considering which of these universities or even which of these philosophy departments was "better." Similarly, a student of psychology might decide to study in a psychology department that specialized in experimental rather than introspective psychology confident that both departments would have faculties well-trained and qualified to teach their courses. Although in actuality German universities did, of course, vary somewhat in quality, they certainly did not vary nearly as much as did the best and worst American colleges and universities.(34)

Fourth, not only did American colleges and

universities differ enormously in quality, but their curricular offerings, even for schools in the same field, differed greatly. In Europe, although philosophy would be taught differently at a Catholic university from a Protestant one and psychology differently in an experimentally-oriented department from an introspectionist one, these differences were minor compared to the vast diversity in subject matter within such a field of study that characterized America. To use the field of medicine as an example, many of the earliest American academic quality rankings were conducted for the field of medicine under the auspices of the Council on Medical Education. When Abraham Flexner inspected 148 American medical schools before writing his famous 1910 report on medical education in the United States and Canada, he found not only more than 100 more or less "scientific" medical schools in America but also 32 schools sponsored by medical fringe groups: 15 homeopathic schools, eight eclectic schools, eight osteopathic schools, and one physiomedical school.(35) And the situation in other fields of study was nearly as chaotic. In Europe, on the other hand, fields of study were much more sharply defined. On the continent no schools were sponsored by medical fringe groups, for example, and in England almost none were.(36) Once again, since there was less range in European higher education, in the subject matter taught in most disciplines as well as in departmental and institutional quality, there was less need for academic quality rankings and less likelihood, therefore, that they would be developed.

Fifth, because the European countries were all much smaller geographically than the United States, it was much easier for Europeans to grasp the quality of

the universities in their compact countries, without published academic quality rankings, than it was for Americans to grasp the quality of their far-flung colleges and universities, which stretched from Maine to California.

Sixth, and closely related to the reason just discussed, the European universities were so much older as a group than American colleges and universities that it was easier for Europeans to ascertain the quality of their long-established universities than it was for people in the United States. Of the 21 German universities listed in the ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA in 1910, for example, only five had been founded after 1800, and seven of them had been established before 1500.(37)

Seventh, in some European countries such as Germany there were nation-wide licensing examinations in nearly every discipline.(38) Such standardized tests, which certify that those who pass them have attained a certain level of excellence no matter what universities they had attended before taking the exam, reduced the importance of the institution attended. Passing the examination rather than where one had studied served as the important measure of competence. Even in the United States today, there are far more academic quality rankings of several arts and science disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, and economics, for which there are no standardized licensing examinations after the Ph.D. Consequently, the quality of the institutions the student attends serves more as an important measure of ability than in fields like law, dentistry and medicine in which after graduation a student still must pass a licensing

examination.

Finally, in some European nations such as Germany students commonly attended several universities during their course of study. Since they could go from one to another without concern that one would have standards higher or an academic program inferior to those at the university they had left, they tended to change often. Because they often attended two, three, or more universities in their academic careers, starting off at the "best" or the "right" one was not so important as in the United States where students more often expected to graduate from the first college or university they attended.(39) Once again, European conditions made it less necessary than in the United States to have published rankings of academic quality.

For all these reasons, then, rank orders of universities were simply not greatly needed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the European nations where the debate over the role of nature and nurture in the development of "genius" raged. Thus, rankings did not develop out of the studies in this field or out of studies such as Maclean's on the origins of distinguished people.

Even today, when hundreds of rank orders of American colleges, universities, academic disciplines, and professional fields have been published, very few studies have sought to rank the institutions of higher learning in European nations.

Footnotes

1. Though most of these studies included a small number of women, with some exceptions like Francis Galton's ENGLISH MEN OF SCIENCE and Alick Maclean's WHERE WE GET OUR BEST MEN, which were based entirely on eminent males, their authors commonly referred, even in studies based partly on women subjects, to "men of genius," "men of science," or whatever. Galton, for example, in HEREDITARY GENIUS did discuss a small number of eminent women, including the authors Maria Edgeworth, Charlotte Bronte, Madame de Sevigne, and Madame de Stael. Nevertheless, he referred throughout this book to his subjects as "eminent men" (p. 2), "men of eminence" (p. 3), and so on. Since both men and women of exceptional ability were included in most of these studies, despite their titles and the fact that their authors frequently referred to their subjects as men, I will refer, throughout, to the subjects of those studies that were based upon both sexes as studies of "men and women."

2. Following the usage of Galton in his HEREDITARY GENIUS, Prefactory Chapter to the edition of 1892 (London: Watts and Company, 1950) the contributors to this debate used the word "genius" not necessarily to describe someone of great intellectual powers, but rather anyone with "an ability that was exceptionally high, and at the same time inborn" (Galton, ibid., p. viii), "an equivalent for natural ability" (Galton, ibid., p. ix). Under such a broad definition, Galton included judges, military officers, clergymen, and even outstanding oarsmen and wrestlers among his people of "genius." Though later authors contributing to this debate did not generally go as far as Galton in including military officers and

athletes in their studies of "genius," they did include many people of ability, talent, and learning whom today would scarcely be considered geniuses. Galton himself admitted that the title of his book "seems apt to mislead, and if it could be altered now, it should appear as HEREDITARY ABILITY" (ibid., p. ix).

3. Candolle was the famous son of an even more famous father, Augustin Pyrame de Candolle (1778-1841). He eventually succeeded his father in the chair of natural history at the University of Geneva and, with his own son, labored to complete one of his father's unfinished botanical works. See the entry on Candolle, ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, 11th ed., vol. 5 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), pp. 180-181. It is not clear whether the close parallel between the botanical careers of the de Candolles, father and son, should be attributed to the influence of heredity, environment, or both.

4. Candolle, HISTOIRE DES SCIENCES ET DES SAVANTS DEPUIS DEUX SIECLES (Geneva: H. Georg, 1873), pp. 196-197. (Translated by David S. Webster). The original French is as follows:

> Instruction primaire, et surtout moyenne et superieure, bien organisee, independante des partis politiques ou religieux, tendant a provoquer les recherches et a favoriser les jeunes gens et les professeurs devoues a la science....Moyens materials abondants et bien organises pour les divers travaux scientifiques (bibliotheques, observatoires, laboratoires, collections).

5. Alfred Odin, GENESE DES GRANDS HOMMES: GENS DE

LETTRES FRANCAIS MODERNES, vol. 1 (Paris: H. Welter, 1895), p. 527. (Translated by David S. Webster). The original French is as follows:

> Tout nous force donc a admettre que l'education joue un role non seulement important, mais capital, decisif, dans le developpement de l'homme de lettres. Elle n'agit pas seulement sur les natures moyennes, mais encore, et avec tout autant d'intensite, sur le talent et sur la genie.

6. Francis Galton, "Hereditary Talent and Character," MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE 12 (June 1865): 157-166. "Hereditary Talent and Character," Second Paper, MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE 12 (August 1865): 318-327.

7. Galton's definitions of the terms were as follows. "Nature is all that a man brings with himself into the world; nurture is every influence from without that affects him after birth." See Galton, ENGLISH MEN OF SCIENCE: THEIR NATURE AND NURTURE (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1960), p. 12.

8. Victor L. Hilts, A GUIDE TO FRANCIS GALTON'S "ENGLISH MEN OF SCIENCE," Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, vol. 65, pt. 5 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1975), p. 3.

9. Galton, ENGLISH MEN OF SCIENCE, p. 1.

10. Ibid., p. 236.

11. NATIONAL UNION CATALOG, PRE-1956 IMPRINTS, vol. 492 (London: Mansell Information/Publishing, 1977), pp. 263-272.

12. Theodule Ribot, L'HEREDITE PSYCHOLOGIQUE, 2d ed. (Paris: Germer Balliere, 1882). Quoted by Lester Frank Ward in APPLIED SOCIOLOGY (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1906), pp. 215-216. (The emphases appear to be Ribot's).

13. Galton, HEREDITARY GENIUS, op.cit., p. 14.

14. Anonymous, "Senior Wranglers," CORNHILL MAGAZINE 45 (1882): 233.

15. See James Sully, OUTLINES OF PSYCHOLOGY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE THEORY OF EDUCATION, 2d ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1885), especially his discussion of the internal and external factors in mental development, pp. 59-66.

16. James Sully, "The Education of Genius," ENGLISH ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE 8 (January 1891): 321.

17. Havelock Ellis, A STUDY OF BRITISH GENIUS (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1904), pp. 145-146. Actually, Ellis had published similar material in 1901, when an early version of A STUDY OF BRITISH GENIUS was serialized in POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY. The section on the university backgrounds of eminent people appeared in Havelock Ellis, "A Study of British Genius: Childhood and Youth," POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY 59 (May 1901): 64-65. But in that early version, Ellis did not list the exact number of eminent people who had studied at each university, limiting himself to statements like "The Scotch universities are responsible for 15 percent of our eminent men, Edinburgh being at the head, Glasgow and St. Andrews following at some little distance" (p. 64). His 1904 book, not his 1901 serialization of an early version of that book, appears to be the earliest approximation of an academic quality ranking that the hereditarian side of the debate produced.

18. Alick Henry Herbert Maclean, WHERE WE GET OUR

BEST MEN (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, 1900).

19. Ibid., p. 44. These figures add up to 1230, because when a man had attended more than one university Maclean counted both or all these universities.

20. James McKeen Cattell, "Statistics of American Psychologists," in A.T. Poffenberger, ed., JAMES MCKEEN CATTELL, 1860-1944: MAN OF SCIENCE, vol. 1 (Lancaster, Pa: Science Press, 1947), pp. 360-375.

21. Ibid., p. 373.

22. These articles were published together as "A Statistical Study of American Men of Science" in Poffenberger, ibid., vol. 1, p. 388-426.

23. Ibid., p. 424.

24. Ibid., p. 423.

25. These articles were published together as "A Further Statistical Study of American Men of Science," in Poffenberger, ibid., vol. 1, pp. 427-476.

26. Ibid., Table XI, p. 468.

27. See Kendric Charles Babcock, A CLASSIFICATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES WITH REFERENCE TO BACHELOR'S DEGREES (Washington, D.C.: United States Bureau of Education, 1911).

28. For the first classification of medical schools ever issued to the public, see LAWS (ABSTRACT) AND BOARD RULINGS REGULATING THE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE IN THE UNITED STATES AND ELSEWHERE, 19th ed. (Chicago: American Medical Association, 1912), pp. 168-175.

29. Raymond M. Hughes, A STUDY OF THE GRADUATE

SCHOOLS OF AMERICA (Oxford, Ohio: Miami University Press, 1925).

30. The cities are listed in Ward, APPLIED SOCIOLOGY, ibid., p. 212.

31. REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1899-1900, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), Table 1, p. 1168.

32. Friedrich Paulsen, THE GERMAN UNIVERSITIES AND UNIVERSITY STUDY, trans. Frank Thilly (London: Longmans, Green, 1906), p. 443. The original version of this book had been published in German in 1893.

33. REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1900-1901, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), p. 1611. Of course, France had, in addition to its universities, institutions such as the ECOLE PRATIQUE DES HAUTES ETUDES, the ECOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, and the ECOLE NORMALE SUPERIEURE. See Fritz Ringer, EDUCATION AND SOCIETY IN MODERN EUROPE (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1979), pp. 122-124. Great Britain had some technical institutions and also colleges for women, art schools, training colleges for elementary school teachers, and others. (REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1899-1900, ibid., vol. 1, Table 1, p. 1168). Germany had, c. 1910, in addition to its universities, several other types of institutions, including ten technical schools and special schools for the study of veterinary and military science. (Entry on Germany, ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, 11th ed., ibid., pp. 37-38).

34. According to Professor Fritz Ringer in a personal communication dated November 26, 1980.

35. Abraham Flexner, MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED

STATES AND CANADA: A REPORT TO THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, Bulletin No. 4 (Boston: D.B. Updike, the Merrymount Press, 1910), p. 158.

36. Abraham Flexner, MEDICAL EDUCATION IN EUROPE: A REPORT TO THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING (Boston: D.B. Updike, the Merrymount Press, 1912), pp. 308-309.

37. Entry on Germany, ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, 11th ed., op.cit., p. 823.

38. I am indebted to Professor Fritz Ringer for pointing this out to me in a personal communication dated April 28, 1981.

39. To illustrate this point with an example from the area of doctorate-level education, a 1902 study commissioned by the Association of American Universities comparing students at American universities who had received their Ph.D.'s from 1896-1901 with those at German universities who had received doctoral degrees in the same period found that "about two-thirds of the German doctors of Philosophy have studied at more than one university, while in America less than one-third have migrated." See E.A. Birge, "Report on Statistics Concerning the Migration of Graduate Students," Association of American Universities, JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES OF THE THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE (Chicago: Association of American Universities, 1902), p. 45.

Against the Grain: Toward an Alternative Interpretation of Academic Professionalization

Sheila Slaughter and Edward T. Silva

With the emergence of the graduate school in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the contemporary academic career began to take shape. In the main, the development of "modern" academic career has been tacitly explained through professionalization theory. In essence, the increased professionalization of new graduate faculty transformed the college teacher into the university professor. Several interconnected points are included in this explanation. First, professionalization fostered the growth of an occupational sub-culture that guided new graduate faculty away from commerical invention and reform and toward the objective, meritocratic and universalistic intellectual discipline of science. Second, this occupational subculture included the elaboration of new methods as a basis for expertise, thereby providing graduate faculty with technical superiority over traditional college teachers. Third, increasingly focused expertise encouraged specialization that enhanced scientific problem solving. Finally, successful professionalization nominated academics as

experts with the exclusive right to create and exercise a monopoly of knowledge, and the university became the home of science.(1)

While we agree with the analytic importance of the professorate's emerging occupational subculture, the use of professionalization theory to explain the triumph of new over traditional faculty members raises a number of problems. First, the theory is empirically rooted in unsystematic studies of a relatively few prominent academics rather than in representative surveys of the organized scientific community of the time. Second, these weak empirical roots suggest the explanation of increased professionalization reflects the views of triumphant graduate faculty and verges on being a congratulatory occupational self-justification. As such, professionalization theory may obscure the actual dynamics of academic career development. Third, the theory gives incomplete attention to social forces external to the academic community, in the main ignoring class, politics, the social utility of science, and the resources used to fund it. (2)

To broaden and enrich our understanding of the development of academic career, we have drawn a sample of 207 office holders of four national science organizations in the years 1865-1921 and examined their social origins, as well as some measures not usually included in such studies -- occupational histories, participation in the political arena, expert service to the state, and degree of institutional dependence.

Of the many learned societies organized in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and early years

of the twentieth, we chose to study social science associations. We selected these because we are sociologists, concerned with our origins. In looking for our roots, we discovered that sociology grew from a configuration of increasingly specialized organizations concerned with the social problems faced by a newly national, industrializing society. The first of these organizations was the American Social Science Association (ASSA, founded in 1865). It was a generalist association aspiring to serve as a national clearing house for practical work in this new area. The ASSA hosted the organization of the American Economic Association (AEA, 1885), founded as a more specialized forum as graduate programs developed.(3) The AEA, in turn, was the broader organization from which the American Political Science Association (APSA, 1903) and the American Sociology Society (ASS, 1905) emerged, as yet more specialized bodies, after the turn of the century.

The generalist ASSA, which initially succored the new specialists, did not survive as a social science organization long after the turn of the century. The AEA, APSA, and ASS (now Americal Sociological Association) survived and prospered as separate societies. However, these four associations are tied together through substantive content and organizational links. Taken together, they reveal a process of discipline differentiation: from the generalist ASSA, which gives a glimpse of social science leaders prior to the development of the graduate school; through the ASS, organized after the graduate school had taken institutional form; until 1921, when academic professionalization is said to have triumphed. This

sample, then, allows us to compare and contrast the career histories of leaders in the principle national associations for social science during the transformation of the college to the university. Further studies will be needed to discover the similarities and dissimilarities between social science professionalization and the many other academic disciplines that emerged between 1865-1920 and thereafter.

The leaders of such associations were defined as its chief operating officers. For our sample, the ASSA's leaders are, first, its general executive officers (the ASSA's president, treasurer and secretary); and, second, the chair and secretary in four of the five departments. We included the three departments that prefigure the later specialized social science associations: trade and finance (economics), jurisprudence (political science), and social economy (sociology). We also include the Education Department, since it was concerned with the development of social science education at all levels, while we exclude the Department of Medicine, since it was not. Using both Haskell's recent history and the ASSA's Journal of Social Science we located 84 persons holding the above mentioned offices.(4)

Within the three newer social science associations, we again identify leaders by their organizational position. The newer organizational structures are somewhat more straight-forward and near-mirror images, with the central work of creating a corporate sensibility falling upon their presidents, vice-presidents, treasures and secretaries. Lists of

persons occupying these positions in the AEA, APSA, and ASS were compiled from each association's publications of record. They yielded the names of 81 economists, 43 political scientists and 17 sociologists. These listings are complete from the date of each association's founding until 1921.(5)

The organizational service rendered by these leaders is quite remarkable. They number 207 individuals, who as a group held their 225 key posts for a total of 713 years or for an average of more than three years (see Table 1). Further, service in these top leadership posts is but a suggestion of their organizational contributions for they also helped staff the executive boards and councils that guided the associations. Widening our definition of organizational leadership to include such executive bodies would greatly increase the number of posts held, the total years served, and the number of individuals leading more than one association.

Developing data on these leaders presented interesting problems. Many did not leave accounts of their lives, not have all yet found their full-fledged scholary biographer. One hundred and ninety-four (93.7%) of the 207 are listed in standard biographical references. Further, 16 of these leaders (7.7%) held posts in more than one of the associations. Fourteen held offices in two organizations and two others in three. Of the 13 leaders who escaped our grasp, ten were ASSA leaders and three others were scattered among the remaining leaderships. All of the 13 for whom we lack biographies held a post in only one organization.

To compare fully the collective leadership of the four social science associations, we counted leaders in every organization they headed. This multiple entry scheme yields 212 leaders for purposes of comparison in this paper. (See totals, Tables 3 and 4)

To create a reasonably uniform data set, we concentrated on three sources, each with its own strengths. As befits a project organized by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Dictionary of American Biography (DAB) contains balanced and detailed lives of carefully chosen notables written by competent scholars. The DAB was the primary data source for 131 of the 212 leaders (61.7%) for whom we have biographical information.

The National Cyclopedea of American Biography (NC) contains a somewhat larger, more casually selected cast playing prominent parts in the dramas of the day. The narratives are less detailed and more congratulatory than those in the DAB. The NC supplemented the DAB's coverage and was the prime source for another 52 biographies (24.5%). Who Was Who (WWW) was invaluable as an atlas of careers, and it was the main source of data on 24 leaders (11.3%). Information on five leaders (2.3%) came from other sources and is the only material in the data collection originating outside the three standard biographical compilations.(6)

These organizational leaders were also intellectual leaders shaping the content of social science. We see this very clearly in their striking over-representation among knowledge producers publishing in the various associations' papers and

proceedings. Table 2 reports both the authorship of materials appearing in the principal publications of the four associations and the ratio of their leaders' over-representation.

Using data from several cumulative indexes, authorship was separated by office-holding: officers vs. other authors, with leaders of more than one association counted within the association sponsoring publication.(7) The ASSA's leaders out-produced non-leader authors by almost thrice. And the situation is even more compelling among economists. The AEA leaders' over-representation of knowledge production is more than 4.1. In the ASS's Publications its officers achieved a greater than 2.5 over-representation, while in The American Journal of Sociology--a tacit ASS journal--this ratio approaches 10.

Only among political scientists do non-leader authors produce knowledge at anything like parity with association leaders. In both the APSA's Proceedings and in its journal of record, APSR, the office holders ratio of over-representation is but 1.21 and 1.08 respectively. This near parity should be seen in a somewhat special light. The political scientists of the period opened their periodicals to the events of the times in a unique manner. As Janda notes, "...early volumes of the Review contain sections on 'legislative notes,' 'current municipal affairs' and 'judicial decisions' ...These sections contain many entries ranging in length from one or two paragraphs to several pages..."(8) Thus, the Review became something of a current events bulletin. It incorporated contributions from political observers in all parts of

the country, with perhaps half its pages made up of such items. Presumably, a similar policy was used in organizing annual meetings and finds its way into the near-parity noted in the Proceedings data reported above.

Confirmation of this interpretation occurs when we look at the authorship of the leading substantive articles published in APSR. Considering only the several articles of analytical complexity and greater length appearing in each issue of APSR before the current, topical sections, we find a pattern closer to that in the other associations. APSA leaders were authors of 15.6% of the substantive articles and contributed 22.9% of the titles. This comes to an over-representation ratio of 1.63. This ratio is somewhat closer to the others, and sufficient to suggest the import of the leaderships' hands shaping their speciality's content.

Taken as a whole, then, we see the association leaders as disproportionately high knowledge producers. This finding must be interpreted carefully. In no publication series do the leaders exhibit oligopoly and numerical domination--say, writing more than half the works printed. Yet, it must also be remembered that the vast majority of the associations' members were knowledge consumers, not producers; readers and not authors. Thus, organizational leadership is strongly related to disproportionate and sustained efforts at knowledge production, efforts inevitably molding the intellectual content of these fields. And given the high organizational position of the writers, we may safely suppose a certain effectiveness in their efforts

to shape content.

Analysis of social characteristics and career development

To further comparison between these groups of social science leaders over a 55-year period, we broke them into six cohorts roughly defined by the years new associations began. Leaders were assigned to cohorts according to their first year of election to an association office. This allows us to compare leaders and organizations beginning activity at the same time and look at the changing character of new entrants over time, better illuminating the transformation of American academic careers. The early ASSA sample serves as a bench mark, establishing for comparative purposes the biographical correlates of social science career in the two decades after the Civil War and prior to the widespread acknowledgment of the graduate university as the capstone of the American higher educational system. A second leadership sample contains those ASSA leaders who held top posts after the first of the more specialized associations, the AEA, was founded in 1885. These 41 persons were active in the ASSA from 1886-87 to 1909-10, when the association effectively disbanded, and provide a comparison with the early AEA. The third leadership sample consists of those 34 persons who held the AEA's top posts from 1885-1904, the years before the rise of the APSA and ASS. These early AEA leaders represent a transitional grouping, one that can be contrasted with both the preceding and concurrent ASSA leadership as well as the succeedng sets of new social science leaders in the AEA, APSA, and ASS. Between 1904 and

1921, the AEA had 47 "later leaders," while the APSA numbered 43, and the ASS some 17.

As Table 3 indicates, the vast majority of the associations' leaders were considered worth recording in standard biographical dictionaries. This is remarkable since these reference works record only thousands of the many millions of Americans who lived then. Accordingly, cohort shifts in lives reported are direct indices of the relative prestige of each group. The proportion reported in the scholarly DAB is the most telling measure of academic opinion. The basic cohort shift is one of relative decline in reported and hence social status from 1865 to 1920. And this decline occurs most sharply among the ASSA 1886 cohort. This suggests a most drastic decline in ASSA prestige when the newer organizations emerge as specialist associations.

Date of family settlement may also be thought of as a measure of status (Table 4). Here we see a marked drop in the percent of later ASSA leaders with prestigious early settlement as compared to early ASSA. However, this may reflect more about the reporting policies of the biographical dictionaries than the actual date of settlement. Thus, DAB was most likely to report date of settlement, and WWW least. Perhaps what is most noteworthy about family settlement patterns is the relative completeness of the information on early ASSA leaders, and the higher percentage (67.5%) who came from families settling in the colonial period.

Although differences in prestige are suggested by

the patterns of reportage in the biographical dictionaries, the socioeconomic origins of association leaders are not strikingly dissimilar. In all six leadership sets, farming and laboring fathers are notably few, although these pursuits occupied the work lives of most of the general population. Rather, the bulk of the fathers for whom we have information were from better than middle level occupations. More than half are from the respectable business and professional strata, a most striking over-representation (see Table 5). As association leaders are exceptional in the degree to which their lives are mirrored in contemporary biographical dictionaries, so they are exceptional in terms of the continuing middling and better occupational status of their fathers.

While fathers' occupations are similar across associations, there is wide regional variation in terms of place of birth, region of college and post-baccalaureate education as well as region of adult residence (Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9). The early ASSA was deeply rooted in New England soil, with the great majority of its leaders being born, educated and living their adult lives there. The later ASSA is not as strongly New England based as the early ASSA, but is more so than the specialized associations. The strongest regional roots are found in the ties of birth, post-graduate and adult workplace (Tables 6, 8 and 9). Here our biographical sources locate the early ASSA most heavily in New England and the later ASSA next so. The weakest roots are seen in Table 7: region of college education. As a whole, the early AEA had proportionately more leaders graduating from undergraduate schools in New England than the later

ASSA. However, like their forerunners, about a fifth of the later ASSA leaders never went to college while the early AEA leaders had a perfect attendance record. When patterns of adult residence are considered, clearly the ASSA spoke its social science with a New England accent throughout its existence.

The early AEA is perhaps best understood as a transitional group between New England's ASSA and the more national specialist associations. The early AEA leaders were more likely to be born or attend college in New England than leaders of the other spcecialized associations. However, the percentage of early AEA leaders attending graduate school in New England is quite low, and reflects the type of schooling sought. Between 1885-1904, New England offered solid training in the traditional professions of law, medicine, and theology of which later ASSAers frequently availed themselves, but not a wide array of well-developed graduate programs. As a result, 45% of the early AEA leaders sought specialized training overseas. Similarly, early AEA leaders place of adult residence was probably influenced by their historical relationship to the early development of the American graduate school. They most often located their careers in the Mid-Atlantic region where the first strong Ph.D. programs in social science emerged.

The leaders of specialized associations operating after 1904 (later AEA, APSA, ASS) continue to reveal a shift away from New England. They were more likely than earlier cohorts to be born, educated and live their adult lives outside New England. And, there is some regional variation among the learned associations.

Later AEA leaders and political scientists were more likely than ASS leaders to attend college in the Midwest, then take their graduate degrees and reside in the Mid-Atlantic states. Sociologists were as likely to go to college in New England as the Midwest, as likely to take graduate degrees in the Mid-Atlantic as the Midwest, and more likely to live their adult lives in the Midwest.

In sum, during the 55-year period under examination, we see a shift away from concentration of social science leaders in New England, the growing importance of the Mid-Atlantic region, and the gradual rise of the Midwest. However, the regional distribution of social science leadership did not become truly national during this time for the South and the far West continue to be severly under-represented.

Beyond such regional variations, the critical difference between ASSA and specialized association leaders are seen in patterns of post-baccalaureate education (see Table 10). ASSA leaders, early and late, were least likely to attend graduate school, and when they did, most likely to earn professional rather than Ph.D. degrees. The early AEA leaders, operating at the same time as the later ASSA, were more than three times as likely to hold a Ph.D. Sociologists were even more likely than early AEA leaders to have doctorates. While later AEA and APSA leaders do not match the early AEA and ASS with regard to Ph.D.'s, they are nonetheless more than twice as likely as ASSA leaders to hold them.

These patterns of post-baccalaureate differences underpin differences between the ASSA and specialized associations with regard to occupation (see Table 11). The leaders of specialized associations are much more likely than ASSA leaders to have careers in higher education, especially as professors. And many fewer leaders of specialized associations are likely to be engaged in "other professions," although the legal and cultural professions maintain a strong presence in the later AEA and APSA. So too, businessmen maintain a noticeable presence in all the associations. Indeed they are most notable in the later AEA, where they exceed even their representation in the "generalist" ASSA. Similarly, public officials are found in numbers greater than might be expected in associations of learned specialists, with their greatest concentration in the APSA. Only farmers, workers and women considered outside the labor force seem excluded from leadership in the social science community. Overall, then, leaders of specialized associations are much more strongly concentrated in the academy then generalist ASSA leaders, but are not as dissimilar as might be expected given the professionalization argument.

A final comparison among leaders is their involvement in expert service to the state. Although our standard biographical sources seem to under-report such political service, we find the leaders strikingly active in accepting appointive and elective posts. In fact, half and more of each sample held such offices.

Variations occur, of course, among the cohorts. Elective service reveals sharp differentiation between the early ASSA and other cohorts. Table 13 reports

somewhat different periods for each set of organizational leaders, the ratios of posts and persons within each set is the fairest measure of comparison. Early ASSA leaders were much more likely than leaders of other cohorts to enter the partisan political arena as elected officials. Thus, the early ASSA leaders' service as appointive experts only slightly outweighs their political activity, the ratio of posts being 1.2. In sharp contrast, the sociologists ratio of appointive to elective posts is 2.6; for political scientists, 6.2; for later economists, 5.7; for early economists, a remarkable 20.0; and for later ASSA leaders, 5.9. The early cohort of generalists, then, was most likely to hold elective office, and the first cohort of specialists least likely.

Appointive posts also vary across cohorts. The later ASSA and ASS served least, the later AEA and political scientists most. There is further differentiation by level. With the exception of the APSA, specialists were more likely to serve at the federal domestic level than ASSA leaders; later ASSA leaders and political scientists were more likely to serve federal interests in foreign arenas than other cohorts. However, there is not a marked difference in amount or level of appointive service by cohort which suggests the state made few distinctions between generalists and specialists on questions calling for social science skills.

Discussion

Our sample combines the biographies of 207 leaders of social science associations during the years when

traditional college teachers were transformed into university professors. As such, it extends and systematizes our knowledge of emerging professions. And while it enriches understanding of professionalization theory, it raises new questions and suggests fresh theoretical insights.

Of course, the data we present at first glance seems to confirm professionalization theory as it stands. As specialization occurs, leaders social origins become less prestigious, suggesting more meritocratic recruitment. At the same time, they become less parochial and more nearly national, creating the opportunity for a universalistic rather than a regional subculture. Similarly, leaders of these associations hold Ph.D's, indicating specialized technical training. This increasing specialization is reflected in their career choice: most are professors, making the university a home for their new science. When they engage in public problem solving, they do so as scientists, not as political actors. Thus, the leaders of specialist associations can be seen as members of a well-differentiated occupational subculture guided by the professional norms of science, which finally confirm their control over new fields.

However, this interpretation of our data stops where we would begin, since it remains focused on the university and does not look closely at the implications wider social forces might have for the development of occupational subculture. For example, it does not question the extraordinarily high reportage rate in biographical dictionaries for social scientists as a group, but simply accepts the prestige of science

as proper. Yet social scientists may be included in these dictionaries as a result of reportage policies. The DAB, the most prestigious source and the one reporting the majority of our sample, was organized by the American Council of Learned Societies. The Council, composed of representatives of the scholarly disciplines, might have understandably seen the forefathers of their fields as more historically significant than they were.

More particularly, current renditions of professionalization theory do not account for the disjuncture indicated by declining prestige across cohorts and the continuing high socioeconomic status of leaders' fathers. The early ASSA stands out as the cohort most fully reported by the DAB, and the one with the most details clearly suggesting prestige: date of family settlement and fathers' occupations. The wealth and consistency of information on early ASSA leaders' families suggest that they were truly the cultural wing of a regional political economic elite. Yet, where information is available, fathers' occupations look similar across cohorts. They are clearly atypical in a period when most of the adult male population were farmers and laborers. Perhaps regional differences come into play here. On the one hand, early ASSA leaders were deeply rooted in New England soil, at home in the cultural capitol of the era. On the other, leaders of specialist associations were likely to be born in the Midwestern hinterland. The early ASSA's prestige might confirm its elite position at the cultural center but specialist association leaders, sons of small town businessmen and professionals at the periphery, might have had their family prestige

inflated as the importance of graduate education became a keystone of the emerging ideology of a more credentialed society. In short, the actual status of emerging specialists at the turn of the century may still be open to question.

The socioeconomic status of social science leaders raises yet another problem which professionalization theory does not treat; it fails to account for the lack of farming and laboring fathers. Indeed, these groups are not the only ones conspicuous for their absence. Although not reported in our data, there are very few women in our sample, little evidence of surnames indicating diverse ethnic backgrounds, and few Catholics or Jews. The dominance of WASP males with relatively high socioeconomic heritage suggests that the occupational subculture of social science might be as much formed by class, gender, ethnic, and religious location as by scientific norms, particularly for specialists sharing petite professional and business origins in the hinterland.

Regional patterns apparent in social scientists' lives also raise questions about the adequacy of professionalization theory as a comprehensive explanation for the transformation of college teacher to university professor. The geographical location of specialists' graduate education and adult residence seems to be strongly influenced by the growth of graduate schools. New England remains an area of significance, but the Mid-Atlantic states become increasingly important, and the Midwest gradually rises, reflecting the opening of new graduate centers. Perhaps the creation of institutions where occupational

subculture can flourish is as important as, say, the advance of scientific knowledge for increased professionalization. Put counter-factually: how would professionalization have occurred if there were no new graduate centers?

Regional distribution of cohort leaders' careers further suggests that the new social science was less than univeralistic. Few worked in the Far West and South. While the Far West's under-representation is probably explained by demographic factors, the South's is not. Indeed, the South had a higher education system competitive with the Midwest's on the eve of the Civil War. And it could have been the base for the emerging graduate centers. Yet the Midwest's system rapidly expanded to graduate degree-granting capacity, while the South's did not. Perhaps this differential expansion of higher education, and social sciences pvofessionalization, is explained by northern victory in the Civil War. Interestingly, the ASSA was founded to celebrate this same victory and to deal with the social problems of northern-led industrialization. This suggests a century of social science with a northern industrial bias that speaks against a more regionally balanced, and so more objective, treatment of social reality. Indeed, the continued location of specialist leaders north of the Mason-Dixon line raises questions about the scientific inclusiveness and objectivity of new occupational subcultures, whatever their degree of professionalization.

Professionalization theory also suggests that narrowly focused, advanced training is critical for a technically adequate science, and indeed our sample

shows specialists as having doctorates, emblems of such training, much more frequently than others. However, 25% of all specialists lack the Ph.D., and over 40% in the later AEA and APSA do not have the graduate school's stamp of approval. Training and certification were clearly important, but not essential to gaining entry to the subculture of social science. What, then, was the basis for selection or election, and was it guided by demonstration of scientific expertise or other criteria?

Leaders' principle occupations raise the same questions. Specialists are much more likely than ASSAers to spend their work lives as professors or presidents lodged in the expanding higher education system. But for associations designed to promote occupational subcultures, a surprising number of businessmen, traditional and other professionals as well as public officials become leaders. Did they function as businessmen and generalist professionals, or as scientists, and what does their presence tell us about the process of professionalization?

Finally, professionalization theory suggets that specialized social scientists increasingly turn away from reform politics and toward more objective and technical solutions to social problems. And the patterns of state service in our data indicate that leaders of associations organized after 1885 in the main eschew the partisan political arena. However, a professionalization interpretation of social scientists' service begs three points. First, it does not deal with the high level of specialists' non-elective service, especially in the executive

branch. Their consistent engagement outside the university indicates careers confined to the academy were not sufficient to sustain emerging specialties. Second, it does not investigate the content of their work, which, while appointive and even non-partisan, may still have been bureaucratically reformistic. Third, it does not address the continuing high service level of ASSA leaders, thus ignoring the fact that these uncertified generalists were considered by public officials to be as competent as their credentialed counterparts. Patterns of service to the state, then, raise the questions about the needs of specialists to assert themselves outside the university, the nature of their outside work, and their ability to convince the public of their technical superiority.

Alternative Interpretation

The questions our data raise about professionalization theory suggest another interpretation, one that looks at the social forces external to the university and attends to class, resources, politics and the social utility of science. Key to our interpretation is the notion that social science leaders are not freed by professionalization, but instead are more tightly constrained. The very act of specialization increases resource requirements and institutional dependence, making narrowly focused social scientists more vulnerable to social and political currents channeling the flow of support to universities. Indeed, recent studies suggest these specialists may have retreated from controversial positions as they came to understand the constraints of institutional knowledge production.(9)

We begin to glimpse the social forces external to the university shaping professionalization by contrasting the social location of generalist ASSA leaders with specialists. According to our data, the early ASSA can be seen as a high status, even an elite group, able to muster personal and regional resources behind their social science. Although defining themselves as students of the science of society, they did not see training or certification as necessary to validate their claims. For example, substantial numbers of Americans began turning to German universities for credentials in the 1850s, but very few ASSA leaders were among them. They thought of themselves and were viewed as social scientists, but required neither credentials nor the university to practice. Thus, social location and regional resources together with a commitment to organizing knowledge created a generalist social science whose practitioners were free to engage in the political process as well as professional service.

In contrast, specialized social scientists seem to have come from non-elite but comfortably situated families in the hinterland. Their college attendance rate indicates they valued education and may have seen graduate degrees as a way of further enhancing and firmly fixing their middling or better status. But given their lack of substantial personal and regional resources, they needed facilities to produce new knowledge and clienteles to consume it if their specialist degrees were to be negotiable in career construction. Hence their increasing dependence on the university. It provided them the wherewithal to engage in research, manufacture data, journals and scholarly associations, the accouterments of

an occupational subculture. The university also gave them access to students who could be educated to appreciate, and trained to consume, specialized knowledge.

But a price seems to have been paid for resources received. New graduate centers depended on the good will of state legislators and private donors for funding. Certainly the many well-known academic freedom cases document academic sponsors sensitivity to the emerging professoriate's public and private utterances. Accordingly, partisan electoral activity may have been defined as inappropriate for insitutionally dependent specialists, probably for fear of offending academic patrons. At any rate, as shown in Table 13, the early ASSA, not housed in the academy and electorally active, contrasts sharply with the university-based, electorally passive specialists.

Although specialists solved some resource problems by entering the university, others remained. To market their training successfully and prove their resource worthiness, specialists had to demonstrate the social utility of their knowledge, and preferably its technical superiority to generalists'. In short, they had to forge links with resource suppliers and patrons outside the academy if their fields were to prosper inside. The need to create ties with groups outside their occupational subculture may account for the continued presence of non-specialists in the leadership. Indeed, these uncredentialed leaders may have been deliberately recruited for their prestige and resource potential. For example, among the later AEA's non-academic leaders were the following: Robert S. Brookings, a philanthropist active in higher education and in the organization of the Institute for Government

Research, later renamed in his honor; Charles Crane, a mid-western plumbing millionaire active in politics and important in nominating candidates for diplomatic posts; James B. Dill, a millionaire attorney who wrote the New Jersey trust law allowing corporations to escape regulation by the various states; Paul Warburg, international banker and Federal Reserve Board member; Frank Vanderlip, Assistant Secretary of Treasury and President of National City Bank. Similarly, the APSA numbered statesmen and political figures of importance in its leadership: James Bryce, British Ambassador to the U.S. and international cultural figure; Harry A. Garfield, son of a past president of the U.S., corporate attorney, President of Williams College and founder of its Institute on Politics; A. Lawrence Lowell, textile and chemical capitalist, President of Harvard and a leader of international affairs organizations; Francis J. Swayze, Supreme Court Justice of New Jersey; and, of course, Woodrow Wilson, President of Princeton, the APSA, and the U.S.

These non-professorial leaders probably linked specialists into the everyday of life of the state, providing them with access to the expanding bureaucracy where they could serve without jeopardizing their non-partisan standing.(10) Through such service, specialists were able to demonstrate the social utility of their knowledge. Proving the utility of the new specialities through service to a state with centralist social values might have been as important to the institutionalization of social science as producing new knowledge. Indeed, specialists may have turned to service to sustain their occupation subculture.

Yet even with service, leaders of the new specialties were unable to establish unequivocally their technical superiority, but were forced to continue competing with generalists. To enhance their competitive position, specialists seem to have turned to the older ASSA pattern of occupational subculture, uniting social knowledge with institutionalized power in order to more strongly promote their science. However, there was a difference. Institutionally dependent specialists had to accommodate university presidents and trustees as well as their sponsors outside the academy. Thus, they were doubly constrained and did not have personal resources nor a regional base to cushion them.

Yet the generalist ASSA had its own limits; it did not survive as a social science organization after 1910. The usual professionalization explanation for the demise of the ASSA is the amateur's inability to compete with specialists who share a subculture of science and devote their full energies to creating new knowledge in the university.(11) Yet, as we have noted, ASSA generalists continued to compete successfully as experts with specialists in the service arena, at least from 1886 until their organization disbanded.

That such generalists' claims to expertise continued to be honored suggests the voice of elite, non-academic students of society may not have been stilled with the rise of the specialist associations. Instead, the regionally bound, substantively diffuse and decidedly elite ASSA might have been replaced by more nearly national, finely focused and elite sponsored organizations concerned with social problems that emerged around the turn of the century. For example, the National Civic

Federation may have served as a vehicle for a nascent corporate elite to contribute to the development of economics, while elites in the National Municipal League and peace/foreign policy societies may have similarly shaped political science, with welfare organizations molding sociology.(12) In short, the possible conflict, competition and accommodation between specialists and uncertified elites located in such organizations remains relatively unexplored by professionalization theory. However, it seems unlikely that elites concerned with social problems would easily give up their knowledge claims in favor of specialists.

In sum, specialists do not seem to have won a decisive scientific victory over generalists during the period between the Civil and Great Wars. But through the development of a subculture based on shared class location and occupational concerns, a commitment to credentialing along with an ideology of expertise, and vigorous advertisement of their skills through service as well as association activity, they began to nominate themselves as disciples of an objective science able to provide technical solutions to social problems. To counter their institutional dependence and secure the value of their credentials, specialists began to demand a monopoly of social knowledge, and their occupational subculture may have gained as much cohesion from this tactical struggle to convince an uncredentialed society to accept expertise as from their dedication to science.

New Directions

Our alternative interpretation of academic

professionalization presented herein is necessarily schematic and speculative. Arguing against the grain of the conventional wisdom of professionalization theory from a somewhat limited data base suggests many questions for further research. The following seem especially worth noting.

Our listing of social science leaders shows 14 who held posts in two of the four organizations and another pair who held key offices in three of the four. Their biographies should provide us with considerable insight into the dynamics of social sciences' institutionalization in higher education since each of their lives will shed light on two or more associations. Did they see themselves exchanging their service for the resources necessary to build careers and develop departments and disciplines? How did they respond to colleagues and non-academics with alternative visions of social science and its uses? For whom and for what was their social science? Further, the biographies of leaders active in several associations might clarify the process of specialization. Did they join a variety of new associations because they found each new field addressing unique scientific problems? Or was their participation in new specialist associations a way of meeting career expectations existing ones could not fulfill?(13) Or might they compose a group who functioned to link the associations together, perhaps acting as academic ambassadors to the wider university community or funding sources?

And what of the many non-academics found in organized social scientists' higher circles? While the resource requirements of university-based scholars might explain

their acceptance of men of affairs as colleagues in organizations charged with sustaining the unique subculture that professionalization requires, why would leading lawyers and busy bankers accept vice-presidencies in such organizations? According to accounts in association journals of record, non-academics attended learned society meetings, presented papers, listened to scholarly discussion and mingled with professors at joint meetings shared by academic economists, political scientists and sociologists, lingering, finally, at the annual smoker. Perhaps a closer reading of their biographies can shed light on the reasons behind their immersion in the subculture of social science.(14)

Third, more information is needed on the extra-academic activities of university-based social scientists. Our discussion of the specialists extra-mural service suffers from biographical dictionaries' tendency to under-report such work. Specialists' work for state and local government is often edited out of academic lives, presumably since it counts for little on the scales of national reputation. Still, since such work may well have been critical for career and disciplinary resource procurement, the service histories of academic leaders are worth reconstructing. Care must also be taken to include service to private as well as public sector organizations. Standard biographical sources indicate that many leaders were active in select policy forums as well as the myriad reform organizations of the period. However, as with local and state service, reportage is low. For example, dictionaries indicated only a handful of political science leaders participated in the National Municipal League, while that association's records show many more of the APSA cohort as active members. Such investigation might

clarify the division of labor, conflict, and accommodation that took place between institutionally independent specialists and resource holders outside the university.

Fourth, we need to know more about the relationship between knowledge production and social service. Were theory and method shaped by resource holders directing academics to particular problems? Was there a division between academics, with some tackling practical and fundable problems, leaving others to pursue knowledge for its own sake? If so, which made the more enduring contribution to the development of social knowledge, academics involved in service or "pure" researchers? Or did service and research inform each other within the boundaries set by institutional constraints?

Finally, comparison between professionalization in the social sciences and other disciplines and occupations should prove instructive. For example, the prestige inflation found in the DAB must not be seen simply as social scientists blowing their own horns for narrow, self-interested reasons. Rather such status inflation seems typical. Humanists appear to have engaged in similar activity; students of other occupations have noted a premature professionalization of American medical practice.(15) Further work on other professions might well show the same. Yet social scientists may have faced unique problems as well. For example, their subject matter might have made them especially vulnerable to outside pressures.

In short, the work of clarifying what happened to academic careers as the traditional generalist college teacher was transformed into the specialized university

professor housed in the graduate school has only begun. Professionalization theory may obscure as much as it reveals. The occupational subculture of social science did not turn decisively away from practical social problems; leaders continued to be deeply engaged in serving both public and private sectors. The biographies of social science leaders suggest that only those with middling or better social status were able to demonstrate their merit, and even their participation was less than universalistic, biased as it was toward WASP males from rising regions. While social scientists may have elaborated new methods as a basis for expertise, their technical superiority was not enough to keep uncredentialed but well born amateurs from successfully competing with them as experts. Social science leaders increasingly specialized expertise may have enhanced scientific problem solving, but the problems they addressed were to some degree shared by resource holders who probably continued to claim competence with regard to social knowledge. Indeed, further investigation of the ways specialists claiming a monopoly of social knowledge reached accommodation with uncredentialed resource holders accustomed to play a part in solving social problems may tell us a great deal about the shape of American social science.

TABLE 1: OFFICE HOLDING IN LEADING SOCIAL SCIENCE ORGANIZATIONS, 1865-1921

Organization	Leading Posts	Years Included in this study	Number of officeholders	Number of years posts available	Average Length of service
American Social Science Assn.	President, Secretary Treasurer; Chair and Secretary of Depts. of Trade and Finance Jurisprudence, Social Economy and Education.	1865-1910	84	369	4.39
American Economic Assn.	President, Three Vice Presidents, Secretary and Treasurer	1886-1921	81	194	2.40
American Political Science Assn.	Same as AEA	1904-1921	43	90	2.09
American Sociological Society	Same as AEA, and APSA except one less vice-president	1907-1921	17	60	3.53
TOTALS	----------		225	713	3.17
TOTALS, unduplicated*	----------		207	713	3.44

*Fourteen leaders held posts in two organizations, and two others held key office in three.

TABLE 2: OFFICERS AS KNOWLEDGE OVER-PRODUCERS IN THEIR ASSOCIATION'S PUBLICATIONS

Publications	Officers			Other Authors			
	N	Items	Average Items	N	Items	Average Items	Ratio of leaders' over representation
ASSA, Journal of Social Science, 1869-1910	61 (of 84)	196	3.21	346	396	1.14	2.82
AEA, all publications 1886-1910	64 (of 81)	473	7.39	335	595	1.78	4.15
ASS, Publications (of annual meetings), v. 1 (1906) - v. 16 (1921)	14 (of 17)	46	3.29	120	155	1.29	2.55
ASS, American Journal of Sociology, v. 14 (1909) - v. 26 (1921)	7 (of 17)	80	11.11	314	357	1.13	9.83
APSA, American Political Science Review, v. 1 (1906) - v. 15 (1921)	29 (of 43)	72	2.48	210	462	2.30	1.08
APSA, Proceedings (of Annual Meetings), 1904-1913.	24 (of 43)	30	1.25	95	98	1.03	1.21
APSA, APSR, Substantive Articles, v.1 (1906) -v.15 (1921).	26 (of 43)	54	2.08	142	181	1.28	1.63

	ASSA 1865-1886	Later ASSA 1886-1910	AEA 1885-1903	AEA 1904-1921	APSA 1903-1921	ASS 1905-1921
Table 3: Primary Data Sources						
Dictionary of Amer. Biography	81.4	26.8	70.6	55.3	62.8	47.1
National Cyclopedia	7.0	41.5	17.6	29.8	16.3	29.4
Who Was Who and Others	4.7	14.6	8.8	12.8	20.9	17.6
No Data	7.0	17.1	2.9	2.1	0.0	5.9
TOTALS	100.1% N=43	100% N=41	99.9% N=34	100.0% N=47	100.0% N=43	100.0% N=17
Table 4: Family Settlement						
Before 1700	67.5	32.3	48.5	28.3	32.6	31.3
1701 and After	10.0	14.7	21.2	39.1	18.6	31.3
Never Settled	15.0	0.0	3.0	4.3	11.6	0.0
No Data	7.5	52.9	27.3	28.3	37.2	37.5
TOTALS (1)	100.0% N=40	99.9% N=34	100.0% N=33	100.0% N=46	100.0% N=43	100.2% N=16
Table 5: Father's Principal Occupation						
Farmer	20.0	11.8	6.1	8.7	7.0	12.5
Business, Manufacture, Commerce	32.5	26.5	36.4	23.9	23.3	6.3
Professional (total)	(35.0)	(38.2)	(30.3)	(37.0)	(32.6)	(31.3)
Clergy	5.0	14.7	21.2	10.9	7.0	18.8
Legal	15.0	11.8	0.0	13.0	7.0	6.3
Medical	5.0	2.9	0.0	8.7	11.6	0.0
Other	10.0	8.8	9.1	4.3	7.0	6.3
Public Official	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0
Skilled Worker	2.5	0.0	3.0	6.5	0.0	12.5
Unskilled Worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Data	5.0	23.5	24.2	23.9	32.6	37.5
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%	100.1%

	ASSA 1865-1886	Later ASSA 1886-1910	AEA 1885-1903	AEA 1904-1920	APSA 1903-1920	ASS 1905-1920
Table 6: Region of Birth						
New England	72.5	44.1	33.3	17.4	16.3	18.8
Mid-Atlantic	15.0	17.6	21.2	32.6	16.3	25.0
South	0.0	11.7	0.0	6.5	14.0	0.0
Mid-West	5.0	20.6	39.4	34.8	41.7	43.8
Far-West	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0
Foreign	7.5	5.9	6.1	6.5	11.6	12.5
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%
Table 7: Region Graduated College (3)						
New England	60.0	32.4	42.4	19.6	27.9	31.3
Mid-Atlantic	2.5	20.6	24.2	21.7	14.0	18.8
South	2.5	5.9	0.0	4.3	7.0	0.0
Midwest	2.5	17.6	18.2	30.4	32.6	31.3
West	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	2.3	6.3
Foreign	5.0	0.0	3.0	4.3	11.6	6.3
Attend, does not Graduate	7.5	2.9	12.1	8.7	4.7	6.3
Does not Attend	20.0	20.6	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.8%	100.1%	100.3%
Table 8: Region of Post-Baccalaureate Education						
New England	35.0	29.4	9.1	17.3	20.9	6.3
Mid-Atlantic	5.0	14.7	24.2	34.7	32.6	37.5
South	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mid-West	0.0	2.9	9.0	15.2	14.0	37.5
Far-West	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Foreign	15.0	11.8	45.5	8.7	20.9	12.5
Does not Attend	45.0	41.2	12.1	23.9	11.6	6.3
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.8%	100.0%	100.1%

	ASSA 1865-1886	Later ASSA 1886-1910	AEA 1885-1903	AEA 1904-1921	APSA 1903-1921	ASS 1905-1921
Table 9: Region of Adult Residence (4)						
New England	72.5	35.3	21.2	23.9	25.6	12.5
Mid-Atlantic	12.5	47.0	45.5	34.8	32.6	31.3
South	2.5	8.8	0.0	4.3	4.7	0.0
Mid-West	12.5	8.8	33.3	28.3	27.9	56.3
Far-West	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	4.7	0.0
Foreign	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%	100.1%
Table 10: Graduate Education: Highest Attained						
Attends/Graduates Law School	17.5	23.5	3.0	8.7	18.6	0.0
Attends/Graduates Medical School	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Attends/Graduates Theology School	10.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3
Attends Graduate School, no Ph.D.	12.5	2.9	18.1	13.0	9.3	12.5
Earns Ph.D.	10.0	20.6	66.7	54.3	58.1	75.0
Does not Attend	45.0	41.2	12.1	23.9	14.0	6.3
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%
Table 11: Leaders Principal Occupation (2)						
Higher Education Careerist (total)	(35.0)	(38.2)	(84.8)	(56.5)	(62.8)	(81.3)
Professor	20.0	26.4	66.7	50.0	48.8	75.0
Prof./Pres.	15.0	11.8	18.2	6.5	14.0	6.3
Other Professional (total)	(37.5)	(35.3)	(3.0)	(17.3)	(16.3)	(6.3)
Clergy	2.5	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Law	12.5	11.8	0.0	13.0	7.0	0.0
Medical	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cultural	17.5	11.8	3.0	4.3	9.3	6.3
Business, Manufacture, Commerce	17.5	20.5	9.1	23.9	9.3	6.3
Public Officials	5.0	5.9	3.0	2.2	11.6	6.3
Farmers and Workers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outside the Labor Force	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTALS (1)	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	99.9%	100.0%	100.2%

	ASSA 1865-1886	Later ASSA 1886-1910	AEA 1885-1903	AEA 1904-1921	APSA 1903-1921	ASS 1905-1921
Table 12: Leaders Political Service, 1965-1912 (5): Persons (and Posts) by level						
Expert-Appointive						
Local	7.5(7.1)	5.9(3.7)	6.1(3.3)	13.0(7.2)	18.6(11.4)	0.0(0.0)
State	25.0(25.0)	17.6(24.5)	30.3(16.7)	28.3(20.6)	22.6(19.0)	25.0(30.0)
Federal, domestic	27.5(41.4)	29.4(28.3)	36.4(51.7)	52.2(59.8)	30.2(21.9)	25.0(61.5)
Federal, foreign	22.5(25.0)	29.4(35.8)	21.2(23.3)	13.0(11.3)	25.6(40.0)	6.3(7.7)
International	2.5(1.7)	5.9(7.5)	6.1(5.0)	2.1(1.0)	11.6(7.6)	0.0(0.0)
Totals: % persons (% posts)	= 60.0(99.9)	50.0(99.8)	60.6(100.0)	69.7(99.9)	67.4(99.9)	50.0(100.0)
	N = 40 (56)	34 (53)	33 (60)	46 (97)	43 (105)	16 (13)
Expert-Elective						
Local	12.5(17.0)	2.9(11.1)	0.0(0.0)	13.0(58.8)	7.0(29.3)	6.3(40.0)
State	32.5(70.2)	11.8(66.6)	6.1(67.7)	2.2(5.9)	9.3(41.2)	6.3(40.0)
Federal	10.0(12.7)	5.9(22.2)	3.0(33.3)	6.5(35.3)	9.3(29.3)	6.3(20.0)
Totals: % persons (% posts)	= 42.5(99.9)	11.8(99.8)	6.1(100.0)	17.4(100.0)	18.6(99.8)	6.3(100.0)
	N = 40 (47)	34 (9)	33 (3)	46 (17)	43 (17)	16 (5)
Ratio of appointive elective service	1.4(1.2)	4.2(5.9)	10.0(20.0)	5.8(5.7)	5.4(6.2)	8.0(2.6)

NOTES TO TABLE 3-12

1. The data base for the total is shown in Table 3 and includes only leaders for which some biographical material was found.

2. Principle occupation is defined as the sort of job held for at least one-half the time at gainful employment between school leaving and retirement.

3. Regions are defined as follows: New England: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Mid-Atlantic: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, the District of Columbia, Delaware and West Virginia. South: Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Missouri, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisana, Texas and Florida. Midwest: Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, South and North Dakota, Oklahoma, Tennesee, and Kentucky. West: Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, Montana, and Nevada.

4. Adult residence is defined as the place lived for one-half or more of one's life after school leaving.

5. Cell entries show both percentages persons and (posts), with some experts holding posts at several governmental levels.

Footnotes

1. The standard works using this explanation include Laurence R. Veysey, THE EMERGENCE OF THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963); Jurgen Herbst, THE GERMAN HISTORICAL SCHOOL IN AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965); Sidney Fine, LAISSEZ-FAIRE AND THE GENERAL WELFARE STATE (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1956). Recent work focusing more explicitly on academic professionalization includes Burton J. Bledstein, THE CULTURE OF PROFESSIONALISM (New York: Norton, 1977); Mary O. Furner, ADVOCACY AND OBJECTIVITY (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1975); Thomas Haskell, THE EMERGENCE OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977); David M. Grossman, "Professors and Public Service: A Chapter in the Professionalization of the Social Sciences," (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1973); David W. Noble, AMERICAN BY DESIGN: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND THE RISE OF CORPORATE CAPITALISM (New York: Knopf, 1977); and Alexandra Oleson and John Voss, THE ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN MODERN AMERICA (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979).

2. For elaboration, see Edward T. Silva and Sheila A. Slaughter, "Prometheus Bound: The Limits of Social Science Professionalization in the Progressive Period," THEORY AND SOCIETY, 9 (November 1980): 781-819 and NOT WITH STUDENTS BUT WITH STATESMEN: SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION (forthcoming).

3. The ASSA has been called "the mother of associations," and played a major part in the organization of the practical and academic sides of social science. On the one hand, it presided at the birth of health and welfare groups, such as the American Public Health Association, the National Conference of Charities and the American Prison Association. On the other hand, it hosted the organization of learned disciplines, notably the American Historical Association and the American Economics Association. We have chosen to exclude the historians from our sample because they are concerned with the past rather than contemporary social phenomena.

4. Thomas Haskell, Appendix A. "Safe Haven for Sound Opinion: The American Social Science Association and the Professionalization of Social Thought in the United States, 1865-1909," (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1973); Haskell, THE EMERGENCE OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE: 104; and JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, 1-46 (1869-1910).

5. The journals of record for the three newer social science associations are listed in Table 2.

6. The standard biographical works are Allen Johnson, Dumas Malone, Harris E. Starr, Robert Livingston Schulyer, Edward T. James and John A. Garrity, eds., DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY, 25 volumes (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1977); NATIONAL CYCLOPEDIA OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY, 91 volumes (Clifton, NY: James T. White, 1892-1978); WHO WAS WHO IN AMERICA, 7 volumes (Chicago: Marquis, 1963-1976). A sense of the relative prestige of these works is

gleaned from a review of WHO WAS WHO IN AMERICA: HISTORICAL VOLUME, 1607-1896, THE BOOKLIST AND SUBSCRIPTION BOOKS BULLETIN (October 1, 1964): 106-109. Written for professional library workers, the review extravagantly questions the expertise of the dictionary's compilers and notes a short systematic list of factual errors to denigrate the comprehensive claims of its publishers.

7. Thomas Haskell, "Safe Haven for Sound Opinion, Appendix B," and JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, 40-46 (1902-1910); Index of Authors, AMERICAN ECONOMICS REVIEW 7 (Supplement, December 1917): 24-56; W. P. Meroney, "Index to the Sociological Papers and Reports of the American Sociological Society, 1906-1930," PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY 25 (1931): 226-258, Ernest R. Mowrer, CLASSIFIED INDEX TO THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, VOLUMES 1-25 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922); AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 26 (1920, 1921); Mark Iris, CUMULATIVE INDEX OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION, (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1970); Kenneth Janda, ed., CUMULATIVE INDEX TO THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, VOLUMES 1-57: 1906-1963 (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1964).

8. Janda, CUMULATIVE INDEX, xvii.

9. See Mary O. Furner, ADVOCACY AND OBJECTIVITY; Dorothy Ross, "The Development of the Social Sciences," in THE ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN MODERN AMERICA: 107-138; Edward T. Silva and Sheila Slaughter, NOT WITH STUDENTS BUT WITH STATESMEN.

10. The adjective "non-professorial" may seem

inappropriate for Garfield, Lowell, and Wilson, but none of them were college professors for half their adult lives, if adult is defined as the time after which the highest degree was taken. Garfield, who was an attorney and businessman for twenty-two years before assuming the presidency of Williams, taught only four of these -- politics at Princeton under Wilson. Lowell spent nineteen years as an attorney and philanthropist before becoming a full time professor of government at Harvard. He taught nine years before assuming the presidency. Although Wilson taught seventeen years at Bryn Mawr and Princeton, he spent twenty-two as a college president and statesman, thus spending the major part of his career outside the classroom. Many leaders in the sample had major career changes, raising questions as to what their primary occupations were. Although defining primary occupation as half or more of adult career years solves classification problems, it leaves unanswered the many questions about how career changes shaped emerging specialties.

11. Luther Lee Bernard and Jesse Bernard, THE ORIGINS OF AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY (New York: Thomas Crowell, 1943); Haskell, THE EMERGENCE OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE.

12. For accounts of these organizations' concern with social problems treated by emerging specialties, see Marguerite Green, THE NATIONAL CIVIC FEDERATION AND THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT, 1900-1925 (Westport, Ct.: Greenwood, 1973); Gordon Jensen, "The National Civic Federation: American Business in an Age of Social Change and Social Reform, 1900-1910," (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1956); Martin J. Schiesl, THE POLITICS OF

EFFICIENCY: MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND REFORM IN AMERICA, 1800-1920 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Frank Mann Stewart, A HALF CENTURY OF MUNICIPAL REFORM: THE HISTORY OF THE NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954); C. Roland Marchand, THE AMERICAN PEACE MOVEMENT AND SOCIAL REFORM (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972); Barbara Howe, "The Emergence of Scientific Philanthropy, 1900-1920: Origins, Issues and Outcomes," in Robert Arnove, ed. PHILANTHROPY AND CULTURAL IMPERIALISM: THE FOUNDATIONS AT HOME AND ABROAD (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1980): 24-54; and John M. Glenn, Lilian Brandt, and F. Emerson Andrews, RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION, 1907-1946 (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1947).

13. Joseph Ben-David and Avraham Zloczower, "Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies," EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 3 (1962): 45-84. The authors suggest that in the German case impetus for the development of new specialties might be the filling up of tenured positions in established fields.

14. C. Roland Marchard, THE AMERICAN PEACE MOVEMENT AND SOCIAL REFORM has worked on a similar problem, attempting to discover why businessmen joined peace societies in the Progressive era.

15. See Laurence R. Veysey, "The Plural Organized Worlds of the Humanities," in THE ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN MODERN AMERICA: 51-102 for humanists' concern with status vis a vis uncredentialed claimants to professional knowledge. With regard to medicine see Elliot Freidson, PROFESSION OF MEDICINE (New York: Dodd Mead, 1970), who argues that the Flexner Report resulted in the establishment of doctors'

clinical autonomy before medical specialists could make a reasonable case for the scientific effectiveness of their mode of treatment.

THE AUTHORS

Sol Cohen, School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles

Arthur Engel, Department of History, Virginia Commonwealth University

James Findlay, Department of History, University of Rhode Island

Sheila Slaughter, Department of Higher Education, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York, Buffalo

Edward T. Silva, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto

David S. Webster, Graduate School of Education, Univesity of Pennsylvania

1982 171